



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

ANNUAL MEETING, APRIL, 1917.

THE Annual Meeting was held on Thursday, the 12th instant, at three o'clock, P. M.; the first VICE-PRESIDENT, Mr. RHODES, in the absence of the PRESIDENT, in the chair.

The record of the last meeting was read and approved; and the Librarian reported the list of donors to the Library since the last meeting.

The Cabinet-Keeper reported the following gifts and purchases:

From Alfred Bowditch, a series of twelve engravings, by Daniel-Nicolas Chodowiecki, relating to the Stamp Act, 1765, the overthrow of tea, Boston Harbor, 1773, and other events in the Revolutionary War; also a colored caricature by T. S. of "Noddle Island or How are we deceived," published May 12, 1776, by M. Darly, Strand.

From Charles Henry Hart, of New York, photographs of Gawen Brown and of his wife Elizabeth (Bytes) Brown, from paintings by Copley.

From Francis Henry Williams, a bronze medal of William Barton Rogers struck to commemorate the Alumni Dedication Reunion June 12 to 14, 1916, of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

From Dr. J. Collins Warren, a medal of Schiller, and two Columbus half dollars.

From Miss A. C. Storer, a medal of Dookie College, Victoria, Australia.

From Mr. Norcross, a souvenir of Mount Vernon showing an engraved likeness of Washington and views from a design by Hammatt Billings, 1859.

By purchase, seven medals and tokens.

The Corresponding Secretary reported the receipt of a letter from Dr. Charles Lemuel Nichols, of Worcester, accepting his election as a Resident Member of the Society.

The Editor reported the following gifts of manuscripts:

From Mrs. Frederick L. Gay, the manuscript of the sermon preached at New London, December 7, 1907, by Rev. Gurdon

Saltonstall, occasioned by the death of Governor John ("Fitzjohn") Winthrop, who died at Boston, November 27, 1707. Winthrop was a grandson of the first Governor Winthrop of Massachusetts, and was governor of Connecticut 1697-1707.

From Miss Susan Minns, two volumes prepared by her brother, Thomas Minns, a member of this Society, the one, a "History of Martha's Vineyard," completed in 1879; and the second, the "Boylston, Walter and Cotton families," compiled before 1904.

From Justin H. Smith, two volumes of transcripts from the Canadian archives, relating to the War for Independence.

Lawrence Park, of Groton, was elected a Resident Member of the Society.

The Vice-President announced the death of Richard Olney, a Resident Member, and called upon Mr. WINSLOW WARREN to pay the tribute to his memory.

Mr. WARREN said:

With the short notice afforded me I cannot hope to do justice to a man of such marked individuality and strong characteristics as Richard Olney. He was my senior at the Bar of Suffolk County by two years, but it has been my good fortune to have known him socially, professionally and politically for nearly half a century, and to have watched his career with the greatest interest and confidence in the development of his strong character. He was ever of a retiring disposition and reticent to a degree. Though far from unsocial, he was so little responsive in manner that he did not make friends easily, though to those who really knew him he was a most agreeable companion. In conversation he was direct and incisive, with a vein of quiet humor; and though never pedantic, he made the impress of a man of deep thought and profound learning. Of vigorous frame, fond of field sports and games, even to his later years, athletic in build, and with an erect, manly carriage, he has been a well-known figure in this community for half a century, and a true representative of the hardy English and Huguenot stock, from which he sprung.

He was born at Oxford, Mass., September 15, 1835, graduated at Brown University in 1856 and at the Harvard Law School in 1858, and was admitted to the Suffolk Bar in 1859. He entered the law office of that eminent and accomplished

Judge, Benjamin F. Thomas, and continued in association with him until the latter's death in 1878; and it is interesting to note that, though less genial in manner, Mr. Olney possessed many of the characteristics of the Judge himself. In 1861 he married the daughter of Judge Thomas and moved to West Roxbury, where he resided for eighteen years.

His progress at the Bar was steady and sure — at first devoting himself to general practice and the trial of jury cases, and later to corporation law, and the law of wills and trusts. As a jury lawyer he lacked the personal magnetism and forensic oratory necessary to success; but in the court cases he early attracted the attention of Bench and Bar by the thorough preparation of his cases and his lucid power of statement, as well as by the quick grasp he showed of the essential points in cases which he argued. He was deeply read in the law, clear in statement, with a cogent and masterly style, and his advice and talents were quickly sought by great corporations and in important will cases, so much so that he soon became one of the leaders of the Suffolk Bar, and for years before his death was recognized as its foremost representative in Massachusetts, if not in New England. In politics he was a Democrat, always a strong party man and yet with a mind singularly open to the consideration of the questions of the day. He served in the Legislature in 1874, and two years later was the party candidate for Attorney General; but he never sought political preferment, and in fact appeared to shun public notice. His utter disregard of expediency, and the positiveness of his convictions and manner as well, marked him as one who would not swerve for temporary popularity, nor cater to any party demand, and while he was admired for his invincible honesty and sound judgment, he did not attract the crowd, but stood as a somewhat unique figure in political life.

I do not think he ever stopped for a moment to ask whether any position he might take would be a popular one, or how it might affect his political friends or constituents. He was always honest with himself, fearless in his pronouncements, sound in his judgment, and whatever he wrote or spoke had such a ring of sincerity that, if it failed to carry conviction, it compelled thought and consideration. Like a Puritan of olden times, he was downright and upright, clear and fearless, with a happy

faculty of expression, and a matured and sound judgment, at times seeming in his indifference to popular approbation to rather enjoy stating opinions that ran counter to the general view.

Though so prominent at the Bar in Massachusetts, his great talents were almost unrecognized in the country until President Cleveland, with his rare faculty of selecting men, called upon him to fill the office of Attorney General of the United States, and later that of Secretary of State. He was eminently fitted for those high positions, and his great abilities and firmness of character soon displayed themselves in his strong and characteristic handling of complicated questions of foreign and domestic policy. His most notable acts were of course in his dealing with the Chicago riots in 1894, and later in his spirited negotiations and policy in regard to the dispute with England in 1895, over the Venezuelan boundary. Grover Cleveland and Richard Olney were kindred spirits in the bold and somewhat hazardous action in both these cases; which of them furnished the greater inspiration in those matters may never be known, but that they worked cordially together, and showed consummate ability and firmness, even to audacity, no one will question.

He leaped at once into the front rank of our eminent statesmen, and when he retired from office had gained a reputation second to very few who had ever occupied the positions. It was a great loss to the country when he left political life and resumed the quiet practice of the law. For the remainder of his life he occupied the proud position of a sort of private counsellor to successive Administrations, and although he took no active part in political life, his voice was often heard in advocacy of his political views, and his utterances received the greatest attention and consideration from friends and opponents alike.

He was tempted by the offer of Judgeships, by the tender on the part of President Wilson of the Ambassadorship to the Court of St. James's, and of the Governorship of the Federal Reserve Board; but he declined them all, and devoted himself to his large practice, enjoying to the utmost the confidence and respect of his fellow citizens.

In 1904 he was prominent as a Democratic candidate for the

Presidency, but his independent and pronounced views and his careless indifference to the arts of a politician were not calculated to gain him popularity or to insure success. If he had any ambition for that high office he was most successful in concealing it, and showed no desire to win political friends or to gain support.

The strong man, the wise counsellor, the eminent lawyer and the high-minded citizen has gone from us; but upon the nation and upon the community in which he dwelt he made the durable impress of one who did his duty faithfully, courageously and well, and left a great and unstained reputation as a lawyer, a statesman and a citizen. His good work will live after him in the benefit and encouragement it has brought to his State and Nation.

He was admitted to this Society in 1897, but other than the memoir of Judge Thomas and his remarks upon the death of Judge Endicott I cannot find that he contributed to the *Proceedings*, nor was he often at the Meetings. His professional cares were too great to allow much time for historical research, but he was well read in history and interested in the historical work of others. His part in this Society was that of a powerful representative of the best citizenship, and of unswerving devotion to all the heavy obligations imposed upon him by a busy and fruitful life.

The Society then proceeded with the business of the Annual Meeting. In the absence of Dr. J. COLLINS WARREN, who prepared the report of the Council, that report was read by Mr. WASHBURN.

REPORT OF THE COUNCIL.

In closing another year of the Society's life, the Council takes the opportunity to review the transactions of the year and to state its main purposes and results.

The Society has received important gifts of printed and manuscript material from members and others. The record of manuscript accessions is given each month, that those interested may know how the collections are developing and that they may learn of records useful in their undertakings. This policy of publicity has attracted the student and the possessors of valuable papers, and encouraged a recognition of the safety

and fitness of the Society as a custodian of historical material. The same publicity cannot be given to the growth of the library in printed books. It is enough to say that a number of important series of historical issues have been acquired, the antiquarian features have not been neglected, and the shelves are richer by nine hundred volumes. For the first time since the days of Robert C. Winthrop the President of the Society is in public life, and to his thoughtful generosity the Society owes a full set in thirty-six volumes of the rare and highly useful "Executive Journals" of the United States Senate, as well as many other public documents of an historical character.

Many wants in printed books remain to be filled, and some are such as may appeal to our members. Files of New England newspapers, bound or unbound, are always welcome, and the same may be said of pamphlets and broadsides relating to New England or national political history. The Society needs in its reference library such standard works as the Reports of Decisions of the U. S. Supreme Court, *Niles' Weekly Register*, and English law books of the seventeenth century. The practice of preserving and binding newspapers has almost disappeared among their subscribers, and few law offices accumulate the records of decisions of the past: yet there may exist such material, and the Society would be a fit place of deposit.

It is a matter for regret that the Society in the past has not insisted upon receiving a copy of every publication by its members. It is sufficient to glance over the list of its membership to realize how much could have been thus obtained, and how interesting a showing the whole would afford. Apart from the immediate historical nature of such a collection, the personal qualities would have been notable. It would have contained most of the leading writings on American history during the last century; it would have had the first issues of many literary as well as historical works, and coming from the authors, each volume would have some association or remembrance of the writer's interest in the Society. It is vain to regret what has not been done; but the suggestion of a future gift of this nature by our members comes with some pertinency now, when nothing is required of them by the Society except a lively interest in its welfare and permanent interests.

In this connection may be named a graceful recognition of

council service which has now been shown for three successive years — a gift to the Society by a member who has served his two or three years in Council. The practice, instituted by Mr. Kellen, and continued by Messrs. Greenough and Washburn, is one to be encouraged. From the first two the materials for the study of the early history of Massachusetts were enriched by photographic reproduction of thousands of records located elsewhere; and from Mr. Washburn the Society received original manuscripts and will receive a volume of Collections based upon them.

This leads us to the publications of the Society, the evidence of its continued productiveness in what has given to it its greatest distinction. The volume of *Proceedings* (XLIX in the series) appeared in October, with contents rich in historical reference and documents. The volume of Warren-Adams Letters, forming volume LXXII of the Collections, is in press, and two other volumes of Collections are in process — the Jasper Mauduit Papers, contributed by Mr. Washburn, and the Phips' Treasure Search, contributed by Mrs. Frederick L. Gay. Both will probably be issued during the coming year.

The photostat continues to be fully occupied, and the results prove its utility. The reproduction of the *Boston News-Letter* has now reached through the year 1722. What this means may be thus expressed: 833 issues of the newspaper, or 1890 newspaper pages form a single set in the reproduction, and seventeen sets, or more than 32,000 pages, have been printed, thus placing in seventeen libraries every known issue for the period covered of this earliest of American newspapers in the English language. This makes the undertaking the largest of its kind yet successfully accomplished. It is planned to issue nine more years during the coming year. In addition there have been printed on other orders editions from manuscript of the Parliament Debates of 1626, Milton (Mass.) Church Records, and a vocabulary of a native language of Mexico. The total number of prints made in the last year was 23,191, a gain of 3280 over the product of the previous year. Alterations in paper and chemicals imposed by the war, not to speak of rising prices, have presented problems which Mr. Pearman, the operator of the machine, has overcome with the coöperation of the manufacturer. It is a pleasure to note that the prints sent out by the

Society are recognized as among the best in workmanship, a matter of no little import where carelessness affects the permanency of the print.

The Society has sought to obtain from other depositories in the form of photostatic prints what is needed to complete its possessions. Mr. Winthrop gave to the State of Connecticut some Winthrop papers. Negatives (more than 1000) of these have been obtained. The records and papers of the Boston Committee of Correspondence passed with the Bancroft Collection into the New York Public Library. These are now being photographed for this Society, and we have already received more than 1600 prints on this single item. So, also, a photostatic reproduction of Washington's Ledger A, in the Washington Papers, in the Library of Congress, has been secured — an invaluable personal record of Washington before the War of Independence. Through the courtesy of Mr. James Donovan, City Clerk of Boston, the Society was permitted to photostat the record of "Bonds for Security against Strangers, 1679-1700"; and Miss Helen G. Powers kindly consented to allow a reproduction to be made of an interleaved almanac of 1780, with notes by Col. Caleb Gibbs, in command of Washington's guard. The record is that for the year of Arnold's treason. These are only instances of the manner in which the Society is accumulating historical material, hitherto wholly or almost inaccessible to local students of history, and even not known to exist.

A year ago the Society enlarged its bindery, so as to prepare and bind not only its manuscripts, but also its printed books, pamphlets and newspapers. Acting under authority of the Council the necessary machines and implements were obtained, and in time the experiment was in operation. The extraordinary rise in price of all materials used in binding, and the impossibility of obtaining such items as hand-made and foreign papers and leathers, have interfered somewhat with the intended development of the bindery. Yet the experience of a year under such disadvantages has fulfilled the expectations entertained at the outset. In place of having two or three hundred volumes bound by an outside shop each year — a number absurdly out of proportion to what required immediate binding — the returns show that 155 volumes of manuscripts, 386

books,¹ and 1242 separate pamphlets were treated and bound within our own walls, and at no risk of error, damage or loss. The materials are carefully selected, the workmanship is better than that given to libraries, and greater attention is given to each individual piece. The gain is thus distinct.

Nor have the higher qualities of binding been neglected. Leathers are too expensive to be generally employed, but more valuable manuscripts demand such a material. Examples of half and full morocco, turkey and crushed levant, and solander cases have been made in numbers, and confidence is felt that with a return of normal conditions every requirement of a first-class bindery, artistic and material, will be met. The cost is naturally heavy, when measured by the resources of the Society applicable to such a purpose. The same expenditure on binding in another establishment would not begin to give the same results in number, in finish, or in permanency of material.

The Society will receive from its members and bind at cost whatever may be offered. In this way a part of the financial burden will be divided.

In two directions the Society has its action definitely marked out for it. It is a publishing society, rich in its past performance, and as rich in its future promise. The series of numbered volumes issued under the titles of *Collections* and *Proceedings* contains one hundred and twenty volumes, and the unnumbered occasional volumes are sufficient to give more than a volume for each year of the Society's existence, a record which cannot be equalled by any other like Society in the United States. The quality of these publications gives them high rank among historical issues, and the Society's reputation largely rests upon it. In addition to its printing, however, the Society has become the possessor of original materials of history, and notably of manuscripts and New England newspapers. Buy it cannot, nor will it seek to compete with its sister libraries in the neighborhood, which are so much more conveniently situated and more largely endowed for collecting printed material. It is somewhat mortifying to learn of Massachusetts records, public as well as private, long held by individuals without a knowledge of their historical relations, passing into the auction

¹ Of which eighty-nine were volumes of newspapers.

room and being scattered beyond any hope of reassembling and being greatly depreciated in their value to the historian by being thus torn apart from their proper location and connection. It is once more urged that any member, having knowledge of such material, will give notice of it to the Editor, that the necessary steps may be taken to place them in the Society for preservation and use. Here they will be better cared for than in any other depository, because special attention and facilities for arranging, repairing, binding and indexing manuscripts are to be found. At no previous time have these advantages been offered in so good form, and each year will bring us nearer to a perfection which only special and continued experience and comparison of methods can produce.

It only remains to speak of the needs of the Society. The shelf room is practically exhausted, and the situation as to storage and reading room remains as it was described a year ago. With every economy of space the necessity of more space is emphasized, and the library arrangement is hampered. The only effective remedy is a building for stacks on the land owned by the Society, a plan which will permit a distribution of the present crowded sections, give ample reading room, provide fit quarters for photostat and bindery, and allow an elevator to be installed. A building fund sufficient for that end is most desirable. The generosity of individual members has been called upon to aid in acquiring historical manuscripts of special interest, and in publishing volumes of collections. Something more is needed, however, to provide for the future — permanent funds, which may be devoted to such purposes as to the Council may seem good. That the Society is rich in endowments is not true, for the legitimate demands upon its resources tend continually to increase. As it has depended upon special bequests in the past, so it should be supported by special gifts and bequests in the future, and the Council appeals to the generous recognition by the members of the Society's position as an historical society, one which will enable it to maintain and to increase its utility and reputation.

REPORT OF THE TREASURER.

In presenting his annual report of the finances of the Society Mr. LORD said:

I desire to make a brief statement of the financial condition of the Society, supplementing what is set forth in detail in the Treasurer's report submitted in print.

The property of the Society may be divided conveniently as follows:

1. The Land and Buildings, which stand on the books at \$97,990.32 and are valued by the City Assessors at \$196,000.

2. The Library and Collections, which have never been appraised.

3. The Investments of the Society, which are carried on the books, as appears in the Investment Account, Exhibit I of the Treasurer's Report, at \$494,087.12. Of this sum the two centenary funds amount to \$72,786.19, of which amount \$66,991.03 is the principal of the Sibley Centenary Fund and \$5,795.16 of the Anonymous Fund. Under the terms of the bequests the income of these funds must be added to the principal until the expiration of one hundred years from their receipt, or, in the case of the Sibley Centenary Fund, the year 2002, and in the case of the Anonymous Fund the year 1991.

The gross income of the Society from all sources the past year was \$32,200.05, of which \$25,880.96 was the income of the invested funds. From this gross income must be deducted the income of the two centenary funds, which under the terms of the gifts are to be added annually to the principal, amounting to \$3,466.01, and leaving a balance of income available for the general purposes of the Society of \$28,734.04.

From the sale of electrotypes the sum of \$1,989.78 was received and added to the principal of the General Fund.

The increase in invested funds the past year is \$11,760.73, as shown in detail in Exhibit III.

The Investment Account stands on the books at \$494,087, but the market value of the investments is \$536,760.

In compliance with the requirements of the By-Laws, Chapter VII., Article 2, the Treasurer respectfully submits his Annual Report, made up to March 31, 1917.

The special funds now held by the Treasurer are thirty in number. A list of these funds, with the income and expenditure of each fund the past year, appears in Exhibit V in this report. An account of twenty-nine of these funds, giving a brief history of each fund, will be found in the Treasurer's Report for the year ending March 31, 1910 (*Proceedings*, XLIII. 529); the thirtieth is described in the Treasurer's Report for the year ending March 31, 1911 (*Proceedings*, XLIV. 568). The securities held by the Treasurer as investments on account of the above-mentioned funds are as follows:

INVESTMENTS.

SCHEDULE OF BONDS.

Chicago & West Michigan R. R. Co.	5%	1921	\$14,000.00
Chicago & North Michigan R. R. Co.	5%	1931	1,000.00
Rio Grande Western R. R. Co.	4%	1939	5,000.00
Cincinnati, Dayton & Ironton R. R.	5%	1941	5,000.00
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé R. R.	4%	1995	14,500.00
Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé R. R.	4%	1995 "adjustment"	9,000.00
Chicago Jct. & Union Stock Yards	5%	1940	10,000.00
Oregon Short Line R. R. Co.	5%	1946	10,000.00
Oregon Short Line R. R. Co.	4%	1929	10,000.00
Boston & Maine R. R. Co.	4½%	1944	6,000.00
American Tel. & Tel. Co.	4%	1929	10,000.00
Northern Pacific & Gt. Northern R. R.	4%	1921 "joint"	50,000.00
Long Island R. R. Co.	4%	1949	6,000.00
New York Central & Hudson River R. R.	4%	1934	15,000.00
Bangor & Aroostook R. R. Co.	4%	1951	10,000.00
Detroit, Grand Rapids & Western R. R.	4%	1946	2,000.00
Fitchburg R. R. Co.	4%	1927	9,000.00
Kansas City, Clinton & Springfield R. R.	5%	1925	3,000.00
Lowell, Lawrence & Haverhill St. R. R.	5%	1923	2,000.00
Washington Water Power Co.	5%	1939	10,000.00
United Electric Securities	5%		25,000.00
Blackstone Valley Gas & Elec. Co.	5%	1939	10,000.00
Western Tel. & Tel. Co.	5%	1932	5,000.00
Seattle Electric Co.	5%	1929	5,000.00
Detroit Edison Co.	5%	1933	5,000.00
U. S. Steel Corporation	5%	1963	5,000.00
Boston Elevated Railway	5%	1942	8,000.00
New England Tel. & Tel. Co.	5%	1932	10,000.00
Connecticut Power Co.	5%	1963	10,000.00
Boston & Albany R. R.	5%	1938	10,000.00
Cleveland Short Line R. R.	4½%	1961	10,000.00
Arlington Gas Light Co.	5%	1927	10,000.00
United Elec. Lt. & Power Co.	4½%	1929	10,000.00
Wilmington City Electric Co.	5%	1951	5,000.00
City of New York	6%	1917	2,000.00
City of Cleveland	5%	1917	8,000.00
Old Colony Gas Co.	5%	1931	5,000.00
Dedham Water Co.	5%	1935	5,000.00
United Zinc & Chemical Co.	5%	1928	30,000.00
(with 60 shares pfd., and 60 common)			
Railway & Light Securities Co.	5%	1946	5,000.00
Plymouth Electric Light Co.	5%		4,000.00
Par value			<u>\$388,500.00</u>

SCHEDULE OF STOCKS.

50	Merchants National Bank, Boston	\$5,000.00
50	National Union Bank, Boston	5,000.00
50	Second National Bank, Boston	5,000.00
50	National Shawmut Bank, Boston	5,000.00
35	Boston & Albany R. R. Co.	3,500.00
25	Old Colony R. R. Co.	2,500.00
25	Fitchburg R. R. Co. Pfd.	2,500.00
150	Chicago Jct. Rys. & Union Stock Yards Co. Pfd.	15,000.00
75	American Smelting & Refining Co. Pfd.	7,500.00
158	Atchison, Topeka & Santa Fé R. R. Co. Pfd.	15,800.00
302	Kansas City Stock Yards Co. Pfd.	30,200.00
10	Cincinnati Gas & Electric Co.	1,000.000
6	Boston Real Estate Trust	6,000.00
5	State Street Exchange	500.00
150	Pacific Mills	15,000.00
52	Puget Sound Traction Light and Power Co. Pfd.	5,200.00
5	" " " " " " " " Common	500.00
50	American Telephone & Telegraph Co.	5,000.00
50	American Sugar Refining Co. Pfd.	5,000.00
1298	Shares Par value	<u>\$135,200.00</u>

SCHEDULE OF SAVINGS BANK BOOKS.

M. A. Parker Fund	\$1,260.69
Brattle St. Church Model Fund	219.87
	<u>\$1,480.56</u>

RECAPITULATION.

Bonds, par value	\$388,500.00
Stocks, par value	135,200.00
Savings Bank Books	1,480.56
	<u>\$525,180.56</u>

The balance sheet follows and shows the present condition of the several accounts:

BALANCE SHEET, March 31, 1917.

Investment Account,		Funds, Exhibit III . . .	\$448,646.62
Exhibit I	\$494,087.12	Accumulated Income of	
Cash on hand, Exhibit II	3,258.32	Funds, Exhibit IV . .	48,698.82
	<u>\$497,345.44</u>		<u>\$497,345.44</u>

EXHIBIT I.

INVESTMENT ACCOUNT.

<i>Balance, April 1, 1916</i>	\$482,326.39
Bought during year:	
50 Shares American Sugar R'f'g Co. Pfd. . .	\$5,781.25
\$1,000 Consumers Power Co., 5%, 1936	1,000.00
1,000 United Electric Securities Co., Series 28, due	
1939	1,000.00
5,000 Railway & Light Securities Co., 5%, due 1946	4,950.00
4,000 Plymouth Electric Light Co.	4,000.00
Accrued Interest M. A. Parker Savings Bank Book . .	45.96
" " Brattle St. Church Model Bank Book	8.52
<i>Total Additions, Exhibit II</i>	16,785.73
	<u>\$499,112.12</u>
Securities matured and sold:	
\$1,000 United Electric Securities Co., 5% Series 30	\$1,025.00
1,000 Consumers Power Co., 5%, 1936	1,000.00
3,000 City of New York, 6%	3,000.00
<i>Total Deductions, Exhibit II</i>	5,025.00
Balance, March 31, 1917	<u>\$494,087.12</u>

EXHIBIT II.

CASH ACCOUNT.

<i>Balance on hand, April 1, 1916</i>			\$9,688.25
<i>Receipts during year to March 31, 1917:</i>			
Sales by Library:			
Publications	\$479.02		
Photostat ¹	3,437.44		
Duplicates	664.50		
Bindery	171.85		
Royalties, Little Brown & Co.	8.54		
" Houghton Mifflin & Co.			
" Adams"	<u>1,546.63</u>	\$6,307.98	
Rebates		<u>11.11</u>	
Credited to General Fund Income		6,319.09	
Interest on Bank Balances	174.56		
" " Savings Bank Books	54.48		
Income from Investments	<u>25,651.96</u>		
Total		<u>25,880.96</u>	
Total credited to Income of Funds, Exhibit V			\$32,200.05
Securities sold or matured			5,025.00
Electrotypes sold, credited to Principal General Fund			<u>1,089.78</u>
			\$48,903.08
<i>Charges during year to March 31, 1917:</i>			
Investment Account: Securities bought.	\$16,731.25		
Savings Bank Interest	<u>54.48</u>		
Total additions, Exhibit I		\$16,785.73	
Income Account:			
Bindery, Wages	\$1,411.60		
Supplies	880.55		
Plant	<u>572.44</u>	\$2,864.59	
Books, Pamphlets, Newspapers, and Mss.	2,471.78		
Building:			
Cleaning	\$366.45		
Engineer	1,063.35		
Fuel	543.75		
Furniture	221.27		
Light	393.96		
Repairs	1,820.12		
Telephone	118.54		
Water	<u>78.40</u>	4,605.84	
Photostat		3,369.25	
Portraits		242.85	
Postage		<u>162.02</u>	
Carry forward		<u>\$13,716.33</u>	<u>\$16,785.73</u>
			\$48,903.08

¹ Includes \$398.60 due on work done in the previous year.

CASH ACCOUNT — *Continued.*

Brought forward	\$13,716.33	\$16,785.73	\$48,903.08
Printing:			
Proceedings, vol. 49	\$1,325.15		
" " 50	487.81		
Illustrations and Reprints	452.57		
Adams' "Autobiography"	518.17		
Phips	4.40	2,788.10	
Miscellaneous		83.50	
Salaries:			
Librarian's Assistants	\$4,567.00		
Editor and Assistant	6,080.00	10,647.00	
Stationery		67.35	
Treasurer's office:			
Bond	\$25.00		
Bookkeeper	1,000.00		
Safety Vault	50.00		
Certified Public Accountant	25.00	1,100.00	
Miscellaneous		456.75	
Charged Income of Funds, Exhibit V		28,859.03	
Investment Account		\$16,785.73	
Total Payments			45,644.76
Balance on hand, March 31, 1917			<u>\$3,258.32</u>

EXHIBIT III.

INCREASE OF FUNDS IN YEAR 1916-1917.

Amount of Funds, April 1, 1916	\$443,190.83
<i>Added during year:</i>	
General Fund, Electrotypes sold	1,989.78
Centenary Funds:	
Anonymous Fund	\$275.96
J. L. Sibley Fund	3,190.05
	<u>3,466.01</u>
Total of Funds, March 31, 1917	<u>\$448,646.62</u>

EXHIBIT IV.

ACCUMULATED INCOME OF FUNDS.

Balance Accumulated Income, April 1, 1916	\$48,823.81
Income during year, Exhibit II	32,200.05
	<u>\$81,023.86</u>
Expenditures, Exhibit II	28,859.03
	<u>\$52,164.83</u>
Less additions to Centenary Funds	3,466.01
Balance, March 31, 1917	<u>\$48,698.82</u>

EXHIBIT V.

INCOME AND EXPENDITURES OF FUNDS FOR THE YEAR ENDING
MARCH 31, 1917.

	Balance Mar. 31, '16	Income	Expendi- tures	Balance Mar. 31, '17	Principal of Funds
Amory	\$1,944.00	\$178.96	\$170.00	\$1,952.96	\$3,000.00
Appleton	6,051.92	727.95	1,080.00	5,699.87	12,203.00
Bigelow	586.63	119.31	237.84	468.10	2,000.00
Billings	3,149.50	596.54	335.85	3,410.19	10,000.00
Brattle St.	111.35	8.52		119.87	100.00
Chamberlain	84.98	73.49	78.40	80.07	1,232.33
Dowse05	596.54	540.00	56.59	10,000.00
Ellis	31.80	1,889.00	1,748.57	172.23	31,666.66
Frothingham	2,706.97	178.96	175.00	2,710.93	3,000.00
General	1,632.33	9,706.58	10,551.34	787.56	56,709.16
Hunnewell	1,667.64	298.27		1,965.91	5,000.00
Lawrence	276.54	178.96		455.50	3,000.00
Lowell	396.64	178.96	175.00	400.60	3,000.00
Mass. Hist. Trust . .	6,412.73	596.54	458.87	6,550.40	10,000.00
Parker	22.98	45.96	43.98	24.96	1,000.00
Peabody	2,019.86	1,319.73	487.81	2,851.78	22,123.00
Salisbury	213.99	298.27	349.01	163.25	5,000.00
Savage	774.00	357.92	285.40	846.52	6,000.00
C. A. L. Sibley . . .	168.04	1,342.78	1,173.14	337.68	22,509.48
J. L. Sibley	4,445.40	7,222.82	7,911.27	3,756.95	121,077.00
Slafter	165.32	59.65		224.97	1,000.00
Waterston No. 1 . .	1,646.40	298.27	315.00	1,629.67	5,000.00
Waterston No. 2 . .	4,087.61	596.54	673.01	4,011.14	10,000.00
Waterston No. 3 . .	3,781.81	596.54	652.14	3,726.21	10,000.00
Waterston Library .	30.17	231.16	211.50	49.83	3,875.14
R. C. Winthrop . . .	4,811.96	596.54	690.27	4,718.23	10,000.00
T. L. Winthrop . . .	373.65	141.02	107.91	406.76	2,364.66
Wm. Winthrop . . .	1,229.54	298.27	407.72	1,120.09	5,000.00
Balance, Mar. 31, 1916	\$48,823.81				375,860.43
General Income . . .		\$28,734.04			
" Expenditures .			\$28,859.03		
" Balance . . .				\$48,698.82	
Sibley Centenary . .		3,190.05			66,991.03
Anonymous Centenary		275.96			5,795.16
Total Income, 1917 .		\$32,200.05			
Total Funds, March 31, 1917					\$448,646.62

The income for the year derived from the investments and credited to the several funds in proportion to the amount in which they stand on the Treasurer's books was nearly six per cent on the funds.

The real estate, which is entirely unencumbered, represents an investment of \$97,990.32, and before 1916 has been carried at this sum and balanced by the items,

Building Fund	\$72,990.32
Ellis House	25,000.00

The aggregate amount of the permanent funds including unexpended balances represented by securities at par and deposits is \$525,180.56, as per schedules of investments.

ARTHUR LORD,
Treasurer.

Boston, April 2, 1917.

REPORT OF THE AUDITING COMMITTEE.

The undersigned, a Committee appointed to examine the accounts of the Treasurer of the Massachusetts Historical Society as made up to April 1, 1917, have attended to that duty, and report that they find that the securities held by the Treasurer for the several funds correspond with the statement in his Annual Report.

They have engaged the services of Mr. Gideon M. Mansfield, a Certified Public Accountant, who reports to them that he finds the accounts correctly kept and properly vouched, that the balance of cash on hand is satisfactorily accounted for, and that the trial balance is accurately taken from the ledger.

HAROLD MURDOCK,
HENRY H. EDES,
Committee.

Boston, April 6, 1917.

REPORT OF THE LIBRARIAN.

The Librarian reports that during the last three years there have been added to the Library:

	1915	1916	1917
Books	1,502	910	2,565
Pamphlets	1,056	1,436	1,296 ¹
Manuscripts, bound	43	84	155
Broadsides	178	54	96
Maps	35	10	25
Total	2,814	2,494	4,137

In the collection of manuscripts there are estimated to be 1639 volumes.

In the Rebellion collection there are now 3548 volumes and 6639 pamphlets.

The Library is estimated to contain 61,306 volumes, 119,204 pamphlets, and 5536 broadsides. The manuscripts have never been entirely counted, but number some hundreds of thousands.

SAMUEL A. GREEN,
Librarian.

REPORT OF THE CABINET-KEEPER.

The additions to the Cabinet have been reported from month to month and printed in the *Proceedings*, so it seems necessary now only to refer to these monthly reports for the various items.

Dr. Storer, Curator of Coins and Medals, reports that "since the last annual meeting there have been added to the collection by gift and purchase 206 pieces, of which 87 were struck in Massachusetts. The total collection now numbers 11,124 pieces, of which 1286 are strictly Massachusetts — far the largest collection of the kind extant."

GRENVILLE H. NORCROSS,
Cabinet-Keeper.

April 12, 1917.

¹ In the Library 1533 pamphlets were bound, all of a biographical description. This number is included in that of "Books."

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON THE LIBRARY AND CABINET.

The Committee to Examine the Library and Cabinet has held its meeting in the Society's Building, and, with the cordial aid of the curators, has made as careful an investigation as they are capable of making. The chief value which, they hope, may attach to their report consists in the chance that, coming to such an examination with comparatively fresh eyes, they may detect certain conditions which, through familiarity, have perhaps lost significance to those who are in constant charge.

The Committee feel that the Society's exceptionally valuable collection of coins and medals ought to be better arranged and made more accessible. The little room off the Dowse Library, where the collection is now kept, is well located and large enough for the purpose; but it ought to be made fire-proof so far as possible, by replacing the present varnished wood floor with one of fire-proof material, and by substituting metal trimmings for the present wooden door, threshold, door casing, sash and window casing. The black walnut cabinets in which the collection is kept are in a condition which would invite rather than discourage the attentions of the casual pilferer, and should be replaced by properly designed metal cabinets, which would afford better protection against fire, could be more securely locked, would occupy less space, and could also be so arranged as to permit of a thorough inspection of coins without handling. The Society is exceedingly fortunate in having the services of so competent and interested a curator as Dr. Storer. Yet it is manifestly unfair to ask him to devote the time and pains necessary for a proper cataloguing of this collection. The services of some acknowledged professional expert in such matters ought to be secured; such a man, for example, as Mr. Howland Wood of the American Numismatic Society, who might go over the collection carefully and make a thorough report, with recommendations, for the assistance of Dr. Storer.

There are in the possession of the Society something like two hundred portraits in oil. Some of these are in need of attention. As oil paintings require attention about every twenty years, it follows that to look after our two hundred paintings on any continuous plan would involve treating ten of them annually. For this service we estimate a cost of \$20 per painting, or \$200

a year. We recommend that this policy of caring for the Society's paintings be made a part of the Society's permanent policy for the proper maintenance of its property. We feel that the authorities of the Boston Museum of Fine Arts must be better posted on the care of paintings than any other persons in the city, and accordingly recommend that whatever attention the paintings require be given them through the Art Museum's representative, Mr. H. E. Thompson. A sample of his work will soon be available for the members' criticism in the portrait of Samuel Appleton, now being renovated, through the generosity of a member of the family. By adhering to some such plan as this, each one of the Society's paintings would come in for its turn of cleansing and revarnishing once in twenty years, which is about the proper interval when such treatment becomes necessary.

The wall stacks in the Library are the old wooden stacks, and constitute something of a fire hazard. Conditions in the Library present a problem which the Committee are not slow to recognize, and which they contemplate with the usual attitude of dismay. There is need of more room — more shelf room, more room for work tables, more room for such as may desire to come and study. A previous Committee has called the Society's attention to the desirability, not to say obligation, of making our unique collections more accessible to those who are qualified to appreciate them and make profitable use of them. Your present Committee considers that point worthy of emphasis. The mere possession of such treasures carries with it the duty of hospitality to serious-minded and conscientious investigators. Yet all these considerations taken together, the need of room, and light, and shelves, and tables, and fire-proofing, constitute what is essentially a single great problem, which cannot wisely be solved by makeshifts and temporary expedients, but which must be met as a single problem and by drastic methods. We can simply bear our humble testimony to the existence of this problem, and wag our heads, as others have done before us.

The Museum on the ground floor is perhaps the spot where the need of room becomes most painfully apparent. The limitations of space here are so great as to virtually defeat the aim of the Museum. While the rearrangement of the show cases is a

great improvement, in that it affords a better light, yet the eye is so bewildered by the mere profusion of articles and labels crowded thickly together, that it is almost impossible to remember anything that one has seen. The Committee hardly dares to make the recommendation, but ventures to raise the question, whether or not it would be more economical of space to transfer the Museum to Ellis Hall. Here is a hall admirably adapted in size, proportion and lighting for the purposes of the Museum. As a hall it is but rarely used. As a museum it would come into a greater degree of usefulness, while the present Museum chamber might take its place as a room for occasional meetings. This, of course, is a very tentative suggestion.

CHARLES E. PARK.

WM. SUMNER APPLETON.

FRANCIS A. FOSTER.

Mr. DANA, for the Committee to nominate officers for the ensuing year, made a report, upon which a ballot was taken.

The officers are as follows:

President.

HENRY CABOT LODGE.

Vice-Presidents.

JAMES FORD RHODES.

WINSLOW WARREN.

Recording Secretary.

EDWARD STANWOOD.

Corresponding Secretary.

WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

Treasurer.

ARTHUR LORD.

Librarian.

SAMUEL ABBOTT GREEN.

Cabinet-Keeper.

GRENVILLE HOWLAND NORCROSS.

Editor.

WORTHINGTON CHAUNCEY FORD.

Members at Large of the Council.

SAMUEL WALKER McCALL.

BARRETT WENDELL.

JOSEPH GRAFTON MINOT.

LINCOLN NEWTON KINNICUTT.

WILLIAM CROWNINSHIELD ENDICOTT.

Professor MERRIMAN spoke on the Spanish Embassy to the Court of Timour (Tamerlane) in 1403.¹

Mr. MORISON presented a paper on

THE VOTE OF MASSACHUSETTS ON SUMMONING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION, 1776-1916.

On eight separate occasions the voters of Massachusetts have been required to express their opinion for or against calling a convention of delegates, or granting constituent powers to the legislature, to create or revise the fundamental law of the Commonwealth. The response was favorable in six out of the eight referenda, including the most recent, in 1916. I have thought it worth while to tabulate by counties the six votes on calling a convention, of which we have a detailed official record; together with, for purposes of comparison, the highest vote for Governor at the same or the nearest election, and a few other votes on constitutional questions. The arrangement by counties shows the sectional alignment, and the comparison with the highest vote at the same or nearest election enables one to estimate the comparative amount of interest shown by the voters in constitutional questions.

¹ See Markham, *Narrative of the Embassy of Ruy Gonzalez de Clavijo to the Court of Timour, at Samarcand*, A. D. 1403-6 (Hakluyt Society, 1860).

I. *Vote of 1776.*¹

On September 17, 1776, the House of Representatives of the State of Massachusetts Bay passed a resolve recommending the free male inhabitants of each town, twenty-one years and upward, in town meeting assembled, to "consider and determine whether they will give their consent" that the House and Council should resolve themselves into a constitutional convention, to "consult, agree on and enact" a "Constitution and Form of Government, for this State." The people are also to decide whether they wish the result of the Convention's labors to "be made public for the inspection and perusal of the inhabitants before the ratification thereof by the Assembly."²

In the Massachusetts Archives there are returns from only 97 towns on this vote,³ 74 being in favor of granting constituent power to the General Court and 23 opposed.⁴ The opposition, however, included such important towns as Boston, Concord, and Attleborough, several of which urged that the only proper organ for drafting a constitution was a convention of delegates especially elected for that purpose alone.⁵

Early in January, 1777, the House appointed a committee to examine these returns, "and to consider of, and report, the most proper measures to be adopted, in order to the establishing a new and good constitution and form of government." This committee was evidently more impressed by the strenuous protesting minority in the town returns than by the majority. It reported to the House, on January 28, 1777: "By the returns

¹ For the history of this first submission of a constitutional question to the people of Massachusetts, see Harry A. Cushing, *History of the Transition from Provincial to Commonwealth Government in Massachusetts* (Columbia Univ. Studies in History, etc., VII. no. 1), 188-202. The *Warren-Adams Letters*, Collections LII, should also be consulted.

² *Journal of the House of Representatives* for 1776, 110. There is also a broad-side edition of this resolve in Mass. Archives (CLVI, f. 180). The Massachusetts Legislature during the Revolution before the adoption of the present Constitution was often called the General Assembly as well as the General Court.

³ *Ib.*, ff. 121-191. They are dated between September 17 and November 18.

⁴ Tabulation by Dr. Fred E. Haynes in his "Struggle for the Constitution in Massachusetts" (ms. thesis in Harvard College Library, 1891), 85.

⁵ An argument for a full-fledged Constitutional Convention is first found in the return of Concord, dated October 21, 1776. Mass. Archives, CLVI, f. 182. It is suggested in an earlier return of Norton as an alternative only. A convention of Worcester County towns took similar action on November 26, 1776. Cushing, *op. cit.*, 191.

from the several Towns within this State, it appears to be the general expectation of the People, so far as returns are made, That there be a new Constitution and form of Government framed by themselves, so soon as conveniently may be." It also submitted an interesting draft resolve,¹ proposing the procedure subsequently followed in 1779. This recommends that the people be requested to elect delegates "for forming a general Convention, for the sole purpose of framing a new Constitution and form of Civil Government . . . and that every male person of twenty-one years of age and upwards, being liable to taxation, shall have right of voting" for the delegates. Such Constitution as the Convention may adopt, to be submitted to the towns for approbation or disapprobation; the returns to be counted by the Convention, which shall declare the Constitution in force if two-thirds of the people approve; or if not, to frame another and submit it, and so forth, until one meets the popular approval.

After various postponements, this report was brought up for discussion on March 27, 1777. The committee's resolve was defeated by a vote of 25 to 85.² Much time and energy would have been saved if it had been adopted.

II. *Vote of 1777, Authorizing the Constitutional Convention of 1777-78.*³

Immediately after rejecting this proposal of a full-fledged Constitutional Convention, the House made a fresh start toward securing constituent powers for itself. A joint resolve of May 5, 1777,⁴ recommended the qualified voters, at the State election the same month, to choose representatives "in whose

¹ It is to be found, together with the report of January 28, in Mass. Archives, CXXXVII. f. 138.

² *Journal of the House of Representatives* for 1776-77, 216, 244, 276, 285. Only a single copy of this *Journal* is known, that in the American Antiquarian Society, and even that is incomplete.

³ For the history of this vote of the Convention of 1777-78, and draft Constitution of February 28, 1778, see Cushing, *op. cit.*, 204-226; Haynes, *op. cit.*, 86-96; and *Old South Leaflet*, No. 209, containing the text of this Constitution. Vol. CLVI of the Mass. Archives contains the journal of the Convention, and a copy of the Committee Report upon which the Constitution of 1778 was based.

⁴ *Resolves of the General Assembly of the State of Massachusetts-Bay* for 1776-77, 44. It was also issued in broadside form, of which a copy is in the Mass. Archives, CLVI. f. 199.

integrity and ability they can place the greatest confidence," and to instruct them, in addition to their ordinary duties as representatives, to form one body with the Council and frame a Constitution. Said Constitution to be voted upon by the inhabitants in town meeting assembled, and to be established by the General Court as the "Constitution and Form of Government of the State of Massachusetts-Bay," provided it "is approved by at least two-thirds of those who are free and twenty-one years of age, belonging to this State and present at the several meetings."

There are no returns of the town votes under this resolve in the Massachusetts Archives; it would be necessary to go to the town records in order to find how the State divided on the question.¹ The newly elected House of Representatives, on June 5, 1777, appointed a committee "to call upon the members of the House to know what Instructions their Towns had given them relative to forming a new Constitution of Government, and to examine what returns are made on the Precepts in this Respect."² On June 12 this committee reported to the House, which then voted "to proceed in one Body with the Council to form a Constitution of Government, agreeable to the resolve of the General Court of the 5th of May."³ House and Council accordingly, on June 17, 1777, resolved themselves into the first Massachusetts Constitutional Convention.

I have been unable to discover any official tabulation of the returns of the popular vote on the draft constitution of February 28, 1778, submitted to universal suffrage by this convention on March 4, 1778.⁴ A contemporary newspaper statement gives the total vote: Yeas, 2083; nays, 9972.⁵

¹ Boston, for instance, voted unanimously to instruct its representatives not to take part in a constitutional convention formed by the General Court, and clearly indicated that it wanted no constitution not drawn up by a convention especially elected for that purpose. *Boston Record Commissioners*, XVIII. 284-286.

² *Journal of the House of Representatives* for 1777, 15. The Resolve of May 5 recommended to the selectmen "on the return of their precepts for the choice of representatives, to signify their having considered this resolve, and their Doings thereon." No precepts for this year are to be found in the Mass. Archives.

³ *Ib.*, 24.

⁴ There are 180 MS. returns in the Mass. Archives (CLVI. ff. 304-432; CLX. ff. 1-31), from which any one with the requisite time and patience could make an interesting tabulation by towns and counties, and analyze the causes of the rejection of this Constitution.

⁵ Haynes, *op. cit.*, 93, quoting *Continental Journal*, October 8, 1778; the same

III. *Vote of 1779, Authorizing the Convention of 1779-80.*

A House resolve of February 19, 1779, concurred in by the Council the following day, submitted two questions to the qualified voters in town meeting assembled, to be voted upon before the last Wednesday in May. "First, whether they desire at

State of *Massachusetts-Bay*.

In the House of REPRESENTATIVES, February 19, 1779.

WHEREAS the Constitution or Form of Civil Government, which was proposed by the late Convention of this State to the People thereof, hath been disapproved by a Majority of the Inhabitants of said State :

And whereas it is doubtful, from the Representations made to this Court, what are the Sentiments of the major Part of the good People of this State as to the Expediency of now proceeding to form a new Constitution of Government :

Therefore, *Resolved*, That the Selectmen of the several Towns within this State cause the Freeholders, and other Inhabitants in their respective Towns duly qualified to vote, for Representatives, to be lawfully warned to meet together in some convenient Place therein, on or before the last Wednesday of May next, to consider of and determine upon the following Questions.

First, Whether they chule at this Time to have a new Constitution or Form of Government made.

Secondly, Whether they will empower their Representatives for the next Year to vote for the calling a State Convention, for the sole Purpose of forming a new Constitution, provided it shall appear to them, on Examination, that a major Part of the People present and voting at the Meetings called in the Manner and for the Purpose aforesaid, shall have answered the first Question in the Affirmative.

And in Order that the *Se^{je}* of the People may be known thereon: Be it further *Resolved*, That the Selectmen of each Town be and hereby are directed to return into the Secretary's Office, on or before the first Wednesday in June next, the Doings of their respective Towns on the first Question above mentioned, certifying the Numbers voting in the Affirmative, and the Numbers voting in the Negative, on said Question.

Sent up for Concurrence,

JOHN PICKERING, *Speaker*.

In COUNCIL, February 20, 1779.

Read and concurred,

JOHN AVERY, *Dep. Sec^{ry}*.

Consented to by the Major Part of the Council.

A true Copy,

Attest,

JOHN AVERY, *Dep. Sec^{ry}*.

this time to have a new Constitution or Form of Government made; Secondly, whether they will empower their representatives in the General Court to summon a Constitutional Convention, provided a majority of those present and voting on this question are favorable."

statement is in the *Massachusetts Spy*, October 15, and the same letter states that 129 towns and plantations made no returns.

The voting was done at the regular spring town meetings for electing representatives, at various dates between March 30 and May 1. In columns D and E of the table will be found the vote by counties, in column B the approximate number of towns and plantations in the State at that time from which returns might be expected, and in column C the number of towns making full returns. The totals as found tabulated in the Massachusetts Archives¹ add up to 6612 in favor, 2639 against. The committee appointed by the General Court to tabulate the returns reported to that body on June 3² a different set of figures — 5654 in favor, 2047 against. Probably all the returns were not yet in at the time this report was submitted.

The vote of Essex County, a local convention of which had been largely instrumental in defeating the Constitution of 1778, is surprisingly light and unfavorable. Note the heavy and favorable vote in the three western counties, especially in Berkshire, where the movement for a popular constitution originated. The sum total was about 75 per cent of the total vote for Governor at the first State election, under the Constitution, on September 4, 1780, which is given in column F. As a further basis for comparison, a table of the white population of Massachusetts by counties, in March, 1776, is given in column A.³

The popular vote on the Constitution of 1780 is now being tabulated, and will be submitted at the next meeting.

IV. *Vote of 1795.*

Chapter VI, Article X of the Constitution of 1780 provides that the question of calling a convention to amend the existing Constitution shall be submitted to the qualified voters by the General Court in the year 1795. Accordingly a special election “for taking the sense of the people on the revision of the Con-

¹ Vol. CCXXXIII. ff. 198–207. The actual returns are in vol. CLX. ff. 32–123. Many of the returns were made on the back of the official broadside, and in many cases only the first question was voted on.

² *Journal of the House of Representatives* for 1779, 26.

³ From the Mass. Archives, CCCXXXII. f. 99. This is one of the documents, collected for the Archives from some outside source, but evidently of official origin. It is the nearest detailed census figures we have for 1779 and 1780, and is accepted as official in Vol. I. of the State Census for 1905.

stitution”¹ was held on May 6 of that year. A joint committee appointed to examine the returns reported that the whole number of votes were 16,324, of which 7999 were for calling a convention and 8325 against it. “Your committee further Report, that the votes for the several Towns, Districts, and Plantations which have made no return of the Precepts stand thus: 3387 for a Revision, and 2542 against it, and 32 Towns, Districts, and Plantations have made no returns.”² This report was read and accepted by the Senate on June 16, 1795, and went into a new draft, which gives the voting by counties as reproduced in columns G and H of the table. This second draft states that the above-mentioned votes of towns, etc., which made no return of the Precepts³ “are included” in the total of 16,324, thus contradicting the first draft. This was undoubtedly an error for “are not included,” for the two votes are added together in the margin of the document, in the same handwriting, making a total of 11,386 for calling a convention and 10,867 against it. It appears, then, that a small majority of the voters were in favor of a constitutional revision in 1795. But the Constitution required a two-thirds vote to authorize the General Court to call a new convention.

When this result appeared, the House drafted a resolution to the effect that, since the only opportunity to amend the Constitution was now lost, the people be requested on the first Monday of October to vote for a convention for the express purpose of inserting in the Constitution an article requiring for a popular vote similar to that of 1795, at stated intervals. But the Senate did not concur.⁴

The total vote for Governor at the spring election of 1795 (except for Berkshire returns, which are missing) is given in column I. The ratio of the vote on the constitutional question to the vote for Governor was roughly 125 per cent. There was no contest for the governorship in 1795, but neither was there in 1780.⁵ This vote of 1795 was proportionally the heaviest ever cast by Massachusetts on a constitutional question.

¹ Chapter 62 of 1794.

² Mass. Archives, “Senate Files,” 1956.

³ Meaning towns which did not make their returns according to the prescribed form.

⁴ “Senate Files,” 1956/1.

⁵ The total vote in 1780 exceeded that of any subsequent election until 1787. The average total vote for 1793-96 was 21,481.

V. *Vote of 1820, Authorizing the Convention of 1820-21.*

By an order of the General Court of June 16, 1820, a special election was held on the third Monday in August to decide the question: "Is it expedient that Delegates should be chosen to meet in Convention for the purpose of revising or altering the Constitution of Government of this Commonwealth?" The ayes and noes at this election are given in columns J and K respectively. In column L is the vote for Governor four months earlier. The ratio is about 34 per cent. The proposed amendments drawn up by the Convention of 1820 were submitted to popular vote in April, 1821, and the tabulation of the vote by counties is in the *Journal of Debates and Proceedings* (1853), 633. The highest total vote on any of them was 30,892, on the second proposition, relative to the change of the legislative year.

VI. *Vote of 1851.*

An act of May 24, 1851, submitted to the qualified voters at the regular State election on November 10 the question: "Is it expedient that delegates should be chosen, to meet in convention for the purpose of revising or altering the constitution of government of this Commonwealth?" A majority vote was to determine the question. The result (columns M and N) was unfavorable to holding a convention at that time.

VII. *Vote of 1852, Authorizing the Convention of 1853.*

The same proposition was renewed in an act of May 7, 1852, and submitted to the voters at the regular State election on November 8. The result is given in columns O and P. The total vote on this question fell slightly short of that of 1851, but was favorable, a shift of a few thousand votes in the four western counties producing the change. It was about 81 per cent of the total vote for Governor at the same election (column Q). The popular vote on the new Constitution submitted by the Convention of 1853 is given in columns R and S.

RETURNS BY COUNTIES ON CALLING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION

COUNTIES	White Population March, 1777	1779-80					1795			1820		
		Number of Towns, 1779		Shall Const. Conv. be held? Spring, 1779		Vote for Governor Sept. 4, 1780	Shall Const. Conv. be held? May 6		Vote for Governor 1st Mon. Apr.	Shall Const. Conv. be held? 3d Mon. Aug.		Vote for Governor 1st Mon. Apr.
		Total No.	Total making Returns	Yea	Nay		Yea	Nay		Yea	Nay	
ESSEX	50,903	22	14	164	400	1,350	321	962	1,161	917	318	6,058
MIDDLESEX	40,119	37	30	730	642	2,034	961	1,242	2,143	1,506	575	7,027
SUFFOLK	27,450	22	13	829	206	1,878	78	111	2,150	1,034	50	5,290
NORFOLK				Part of Suffolk			639	528	1,119	1,172	534	3,933
PLYMOUTH	26,906	14	9	399	390	597	520	494	854	785	433	3,574
BARNSTABLE	15,344	10	4	25	57	205	185	112	367	97	48	936
DUKES AND NANTUCKET	7,234	4	0	0	0	0	56	93	178	69	53	667
BRISTOL	26,656	12	8	380	175	777	384	788	825	734	358	3,427
WORCESTER	46,331	44	37	1,824	317	2,109	1,235	1,405	2,540	2,379	1,430	9,086
HAMPSHIRE	34,315	46	29	1,256	95	1,601	835	1,289	2,400	412	1,078	3,306
FRANKLIN				Part of Hampshire						623	685	3,132
HAMPDEN				Part of Hampshire						790	447	2,738
BERKSHIRE	18,552	24	13	972	3	1,010	397	478	No Returns	1,218	584	4,123
MAINE COUNTIES	50,066	52	9	33	374	600	2,388	823	3,973	Separate State		
Additional Returns							3,387	2,542				
TOTAL	343,876	287	176	6,612	2,659	12,221	11,386	10,867	17,710	11,756	6,593	53,297
SOURCE OF STATISTICS . . . (The Votes for Governor are taken from the bound Abstracts in the Mass. Archives.)	Mass. Arch. 332:99.		Mass. Arch. 160: 32-123.	Mass. Arch. 233: 198-207.			Mass. Arch. Senate Files, 1956.			Mass. Arch. Misc. Files, Box 19.		

N CALLING A CONSTITUTIONAL CONVENTION IN MASSACHUSETTS.

1795			1820			1851		1852			1853		1916		
Shall Const. Conv. be held? May 6		Vote for Governor 1st Mon. Apr.	Shall Const. Conv. be held? 3d Mon. Aug.		Vote for Governor 1st Mon. Apr.	Shall Const. Conv. be held? Nov. 10		Shall Const. Conv. be held? Nov. 8		Vote for Governor Nov. 8	Vote on new Constitution. Nov. 14		Shall Const. Conv. be held? Nov. 7		Vote for Governor Nov. 7
Yea	Nay		Yea	Nay		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay		Yea	Nay	Yea	Nay	
G	H	I	J	K	L	M	N	O	P	Q	R	S	T	U	V
321	962	1,161	917	318	6,058	8,105	9,436	8,567	7,760	18,119	7,998	9,099	26,797	18,145	70,581
961	1,242	2,143	1,506	575	7,027	10,572	10,962	10,755	10,049	22,987	10,339	12,178	48,086	27,482	112,718
78	111	2,150	1,034	50	5,290	4,265	7,656	3,977	6,880	13,211	3,673	9,588	56,281	19,187	105,496
639	528	1,119	1,172	534	3,933	4,279	5,326	4,569	4,911	10,904	4,086	6,386	13,450	7,810	32,834
520	494	854	785	433	3,574	4,299	4,125	4,368	3,853	9,122	4,074	4,327	10,116	5,739	25,523
185	112	367	97	48	936	540	1,607	1,063	1,450	2,943	1,294	1,650	1,198	1,183	4,585
56	93	178	69	53	667	229	544	566	609	1,380	405	632	339	283	982
384	788	825	734	358	3,427	4,376	4,452	5,166	4,263	10,289	5,009	4,978	14,681	10,543	40,973
1,235	1,405	2,540	2,379	1,430	9,086	12,101	7,934	13,453	7,333	21,597	12,935	7,724	21,734	12,962	61,177
835	1,289	2,400	412	1,078	3,306	2,538	3,687	2,729	3,244	6,281	2,698	2,935	2,898	2,872	10,042
			623	685	3,132	2,918	2,575	3,201	2,427	5,958	3,133	2,514	2,106	1,793	7,321
			790	447	2,738	3,326	3,748	3,986	3,222	7,865	3,792	2,978	13,213	9,228	35,594
397	478	No Returns 3,973	1,218 Separate State	584	4,123	3,424	3,804	4,066	3,111	7,794	3,785	3,161	6,394	3,832	18,295
2,388	823														
3,387	2,542														
11,386	10,867	17,710	11,756	6,593	53,297	60,972	65,846	66,416	59,122	138,450	63,222	68,150	217,293	120,979	526,421
Mass. Arch. Senate Files, 1956.			Mass. Arch. Misc. Files, Box 19.			Mass. Arch. Council Records, 1851, p. 280.		Mass. Arch. Council Files, Dec. 1852.			Printed Journal of the Con- vention, p. 541.		Printed Report of Committee of Whole Council, Dec. 6, 1916.		Manual for Gen- eral Court.

VIII. *Vote of 1916, Authorizing the Convention of 1917.*

Chapter 98 of the General Acts of 1916, "to ascertain and carry out the will of the people relative to the calling and holding of a Constitutional Convention,"¹ placed on the ballot at the State election of November 7, the question: "Shall there be a convention to revise, alter, or amend the constitution of the Commonwealth?" The vote on this question is given in columns T and U. The total is about 64 per cent of the total vote for Governor at the same election, given in column V.

Section 2 of chapter 98 provides that the Convention shall consist of 320 members, 16 to be selected at large, 4 in each of the 16 congressional districts and 240 by the State representative districts. As the number of nominations for delegate-at-large exceeded 48, a primary election for delegates-at-large, the first in the history of the Commonwealth, was held on April 3, 1917, the day that President Wilson's war address was published in the morning newspapers. Each voter voted for 16, and the thirty-two candidates polling the highest vote will go on the ballot at the final election of delegates on May 1. The total vote of the State for the thirty-two highest candidates varied from 83,417 for Charles Francis Adams, to 30,269 for Walter A. Buie.²

Mr. FORD communicated a series of letters on

SUMNER'S ORATION ON THE "TRUE GRANDEUR OF NATIONS," JULY 4, 1845.

Miss Sara Norton courteously sent to me two letters from Charles Sumner to her grandfather, Rev. Andrews Norton, and expressed her willingness to present them to the Society. As the Sumner Papers are in the Library of Harvard University, I suggested that these letters would find their proper place there and that this Society would be content to print them. To this Miss Norton agreed. In looking for the Norton letters to which Sumner replied I found a series of letters from other correspondents, all bearing upon the oration of July 4, 1845,

¹ Approved April 3, 1916.

² Figures furnished by the Secretary of the Commonwealth.

delivered at the request of the city of Boston. The incidents, pleasant and unpleasant, attending the occasion are related with pious care by Mr. Peirce in his *Memoir and Letters of Charles Sumner*, II. 341 *et seq.*, but only a few extracts from critics and sympathizers are given, hardly sufficient to give the variety of comment called out by the oration. The questions then treated arise periodically, witness Kant's plea for universal peace, John Quincy Adams' instructions on the abolition of private war on the sea and this essay by Sumner. The incidents of that particular day, so different from the usual expressions of celebration, have become historical; but the comments have a modern flavor and possess a lasting interest through the writers. My thanks are due to Harvard University Library for the privilege to use these letters.

FRANCIS BOWEN¹ TO CHARLES SUMNER.

CAMBRIDGE, July 4th, 5 o'clock P. M.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — You have fully proved that Peace, at any rate, hath her *orators*, more eloquent than those of War. Thank you both for the substance and the manner of your discourse, for sound and Christian doctrines uttered in more inspiring tones than were ever shouted on the battle-field; and for the firmness and gallantry with which you proclaimed them amid all the pomp and *paraphernalia* (wrong word that!) of the men at arms just beneath you. Two or three of those bronzed old epauletted seadogs eyed you very grimly as you began to broach your heretical doctrines in their ears; but their countenances gradually relaxed as you went on, and before you closed one of them began to unbutton his waistcoat, as I thought, with quite a sentimental and penitential air, as if he had all his life been doing wrong without knowing it. I went along with you very heartily and cordially in all that you said, only mentally affixing some limitations to your expressed views, to which I think in conversation you would very readily assent. Hating all ultraisms, I only wished you to disclaim utter stark *non-resistance* principles in their widest latitude, which you would probably be willing to do — principles, I mean, which would compel a man to stand stock still on Washington Street, and take a beating from any ruffian that might choose to assail him, or to sit equally passive, and see his wife and child butchered before his eyes by savages.

¹ (1811-1890.) He was 'Alford Professor of Natural Religion, Moral Philosophy and Civil Polity in Harvard University (1853-1889).

Discarding these wild heresies, I say, I will shout "Down with war" with you to your heart's content. Grant that this advantage, at least, has resulted from [our] discussions and differences of opinion on nearly all [things] under the sun, that you can give me credit for sincerity in all that I now say, being very sure that if I at heart condemned your doctrine, I should very frankly tell you so. You have enlivened and quickened even the hackneyed topic of *Peace*; you have made figures and statistics eloquent; you have shamed the pomp and circumstance of war, even on its own fair gala-day; and you entirely carried that great audience along with you in your enthusiasm. May the advocates of Peace be proud of their champion! Very cordially and gratefully yours,

FRANCIS BOWEN.

FROM ROBERT C. WATERSTON.¹

QUINCY, [MASS.], July 7th, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — I called at your office on Saturday to see you that I might express my sincere thanks for your most noble oration. I should be unjust to my own feelings if I did not express to you how much I honor you for the high Christian stand you took.

No one I am confident, could be more conscious than yourself, that the views you were to advance would not gain the assent of all — that they would in fact meet with opposition, and every one, I think, must have felt that it was infinitely more to your honor, that under such circumstances you so manfully uttered your thought. Your views are no doubt in advance of the time, but there are good men who feel that they are based upon Eternal Truth, and are in strict accordance with the principles of Christ.

I do not know when I have had such high pleasure as I experienced in listening to your eloquent exposition of Gospel Truth. The fact is that men dare not trust Christianity. They seem to have some lurking doubt as to its wisdom. The very Ministers of the Prince of Peace have too often (to their shame be it said) advocated war. They have been sadly false to the spirit of love and brotherhood which is the crowning glory of the religion they profess.

I thank you for so publicly and so fearlessly expressing your views. That oration will live — it will be a text-book for hundreds.

If God gave to us Christianity, he surely knew what was wise and good, and what was adapted to promote the highest interests of man. The spirit of war is directly opposed to the religion of Jesus and the spirit of peace, of forgiveness, of love, of brotherhood,

¹ (1812-1873.)

are in harmony with the Revelation from on high. Should you never do anything else than you have now done, you will not have lived in vain. But I pray that you may long have health and strength to carry out the divine principles you have dared to uphold.

Your oration must be printed and circulated through the whole land. There is a great work for it to do. I hope the City will publish it first, and then that others may contribute to have it printed, and scattered as upon the wings of the wind! I shall be most happy to contribute to have it printed and widely circulated and to do what I can to send it abroad. With the highest regard, Most truly your friend,

R. C. WATERSTON.

P. S. Should you write will you direct as if I were in Boston. The letter will at once reach me. I am with my family, at the Mansion in Quincy, where we wish we might see you. Why will you not come out between this and Friday?

I preached all day yesterday from the text "Our weapons are not carnal, but mighty through God." In the morning I gave a sketch of the peace-principle as supported by Believers through the first, second and third centuries of the Christian Era, and then traced the history, showing also the gross departure in after time. I send you the last part of the sermon, in which I speak of your oration.

In the afternoon I dwelt upon the greatness of moral means and its power to produce mightiest changes. I say this to show you that I desire publicly to express what I have here written. Yours truly.

Mrs. Waterston desires me to say that though she did not share the pleasure of hearing you on Friday, from all she has heard she has felt highly interested in the course you took. She says, that in the language of our agreeable friend and true Poet, Professor Longfellow, you have dared,

In the world's wide field of Battle
To be a Hero in the strife.¹

FROM WENDELL PHILLIPS.

[July —, 1845.]

MY DEAR FRIEND, — I am in the Natick Post Office, and reading Boston papers. We country folks always come, you know, the day after the fair. But finding that the *Post* is aggressive and the re-

¹ Sumner's reply is in Peirce, II. 374.

spectable Daily ¹ fearful, I know you did well, and I've bought or begged a sheet of paper to thank you for the good word you've spoken, tho I've not seen nor heard it. Doubtless it was right-aimed and hit the mark, since the birds flutter.

How did the old "gray fathers" look at hearing the first time since *our* father's days a word *up to the times* — startled? I dare say.

You don't need support of course against your fellow Democrats (the Post?) but if you do, assure yourself of many private men. Thanks for having at last redeemed one city oration from being as usual, a farce. Yours most truly and kindly,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

FROM ROBERT CHARLES WINTHROP.² ,

SARATOGA SPRINGS, 9 July, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — Your note of Monday was handed to me just as I was going to the cars for a journey.

I write now only to acknowledge it and to thank you for it. I will, hereafter, at the earliest opportunity, deal with it a little more at length. Meantime you will have printed your Address and it will be too late to say more or less. This will be of little importance, however; — for I could hardly hope to change opinions so deliberately adopted. Indeed, if you publish at all, you would hardly consent to make any substantial alterations. As to Dr. Vinton, every body believes him to be a sincere and devout man. Many persons agree with him in his interpretation of the Gospel, and nobody doubts that he is conscientious in the matter. Under such circumstances, I confess I was as sorry to have you pass from the argument to imply censure of the *person*, as I was a few hours after when Mr. Park ³ came down personally upon you. P—— was unquestionably harsh and coarse in his attack, and perhaps there was nothing of a similar sort in your allusions to Dr. Vinton. Still both allusions were designed to hold up to public reproach *persons* who had given utterance to their own conscientious and well considered opinions. In this view I regretted both. In haste, but very truly Ever Your Friend and Servant,

ROBERT C. WINTHROP.

¹ "The oration . . . was an able and ingenious discourse, though, being upon a subject on which there are diversities of opinion, not likely to be reconciled by argument — the duty of universal peace — it was not received with universal approbation — and at the dinner which followed, the orator being present, it met with some severity of criticism." *Boston Daily Advertiser*, July 7, 1845.

² (1809-1894.)

³ John Cochran Park (1804-1889).

FROM JOHN TURNER SARGENT.¹

LYNN, (Mineral Spring Hotel,) July 10th, '45.

DEAR SIR, — I do so honor every manifestation of the reform spirit, especially among those whose position or rank in life entitles them to wield an influence in society, as does your own; and I do so rejoice in your recent exhibition of "*Independence*" on "*the glorious fourth*" by your eloquent and bold address, and this too in the face of an *armed audience* eager to "charge bayonets" on your freedom of speech. And, furthermore, I do so regret that my absence from the City on that occasion prevented my hearing your celebrated oration, of which the wisest speak so well, that I feel constrained to express to you my sincere respect and warmest sympathy, and the hope that nothing will prevent your giving to the public those words which from all accounts are so admirably calculated to do good and promote among us "the reign of righteousness and the Prince of Peace." The men are few, Sir, allow me to say, the men are few, even of those who avow the most earnest sympathy with the great matters touched upon in your address, who could stand up and say boldly and without flinching just *what* they thought in such a presence as you had, — amid the imposing glories of epaulette and the pomp of our "principalities and powers." That glitter of military parade and authority is but too apt to put out the eyes of otherwise honest and conscientious men while it intimidates not a few who "profess and call themselves Christians" even to the shameful compromise of their Common sense and Christian principle. I rejoice, Sir, that in you the City of Boston, and still more the cause of humanity had an advocate and an orator so superior to all temporizing motives and I trust the words you have recently uttered so well may be duly sanctified to all who have heard as to all who will welcome their publication. I am, dear Sir, with the highest sentiments of respect and esteem, Yours, etc.,

JOHN T. SARGENT.

P. S. In connexion with this subject of free speech, etc. I send you, herewith, a copy of a somewhat homely discourse of mine, published some months ago by request of the Hollis Street Society.²

¹ (1807-1877.) A biographical sketch of him is in *N. E. Hist. Gen. Register*, xxxi. 436.

² *Obstacles to the Truth*. A sermon preached December 8, 1844.

FROM ELIZA LEE FOLLEN.¹

WEST ROXBURY, July 15th, [18]45.

DEAR FRIEND, — When I hear of a noble manly action I am ever prompted to express my pleasure at it, and to say, "God bless you," to him who has performed it, even though he may be personally unknown to me; I feel then only the bond of universal brotherhood and he does not seem a stranger to me; but when one whom I may call a friend, whom I have watched with a hopeful heart for many years, when I see him redeeming the generous promise of his youth, and acting from the faith that, "Fame is no plant that grows on mortal soil,"² then I must speak and express my joy at the sight.

When I heard that in your fourth of July oration you had disdained to flatter the people, but had spoken as a faithful Christian friend to them, as an honest courageous man rebuking their sins, so that the timid, the time-serving, the selfish condemned you, my heart rejoiced and I implored Heaven's blessings on your head. Go on! in the name of suffering humanity, of the Eternal Right, Go on! be the advocate of peace, of justice, of true universal freedom, speak for those who cannot speak for themselves, be the helper of the helpless, the defender of the defenceless, the friend of the friendless; be a true patriot loving your country more than your country's favor, asking only for that "large recompense," of an increasing power to do good which awaits the faithful soul.

I would have you and every other young man cherish the divine ambition of being the savior of your country, I would have you feel as if its fate depended upon your single arm. Who of us can calculate the effect of a single noble deed? a single faithful word? Who can follow and fully estimate the influence of one true and holy life? but though no sign should be given that the work of our hands prospers, what of that? no good word or act is lost, this is not our care, God is pledged for the final triumph of truth and justice, we are called upon, only to "do what we can," and leave the result to Him. This principle you acted upon the other day when you spoke to your fellow citizens: you then began a work which if you are faithful will have no end in this life, my heart prays that you may go on, and prosper in it.

I am certain that you will justly appreciate this long letter, so I make no apology for it, but subscribe myself Your friend,

ELIZA L. FOLLEN.

¹ (1787-1860), widow of Charles Theodore Christian Follen (1796-1840).

² Milton, *Lycidas*, line 78.

FROM JOHN PIERPONT.¹

NIAGARA FALLS, 17th July, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — “By the hearing of the ear” I have just heard of your 4th of July *Peace* oration; and, although I have never had the honour of being one of your correspondents, I cannot resist the impulse that prompts me to sit *right down* and thank you. In this you have deserved and for this you will undoubtedly receive the censure of the time-serving, the fashionable and the sensual portion of the community, together with (what is better yet — good as *that* is), the applause of the wise and the respect and thanks of the truly patriotic and good. So, my good Sir, prepare yourself for both. Both are *desiderata*, and both you will be sure of. For some time — for some *years* — the majority will be against you. The *world* will be against you. “But, be of good cheer,” says the Prince of Peace, “I have overcome the world.”

I rejoice to hear of such voices having come forth from distinguished and sober laymen, who are not yet “fanatics” — to hear such voices come forth from *near* the seats of justice and the temples of municipal law. Peradventure they will come forth, even in *my* day, as I have good hope that they will in *yours*, from the seats of justice and from the legislative halls of our land, themselves.

Permit me, Sir, without taxing your patience, to congratulate you upon your success: — if I hear aright, your *great* success: — to congratulate you upon your opportunity, *Felix opportunitate!* — to congratulate you upon your courage. You will live to regard the 4th of July, 1845, as *the* red letter day, in the calendar of your life. Don't be disquieted at the jeers, — or discouraged at the dark looks, or pushed out of your *high-way* by the cold shoulders that you may encounter. Powerful as all these are, they are not all-powerful — the Supreme Power of the Universe is with *you*, and you will find it so, as will also they who now find fault with and rebuke you. Pardon this hasty but hearty word from one who has no other right to speak it, but that right which is given by a hearty sympathy, and a few more years of experience of the *troubles* in which a man involves himself by daring to be true to his convictions of duty and to the claims of his kind, and to the religion that is professed by so many, and practically regarded by so few.² With great respect, and hearty thanks, Your friend and servant,

JNO. PIERPONT.

¹ (1785–1866), pastor of the Hollis Street Church.

² For seven years his relations with a party in his church had been far from harmonious. Garrison, *William Lloyd Garrison*, I. 454 n.

FROM SAMUEL JOSEPH MAY.¹

SYRACUSE, July 22d, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — I am sincerely grateful to you for having improved so well, as report tells me you did, the opportunity afforded you on the 4th of July, to speak the truth in the ears of the people. You will not be disconcerted, I trust, by the expressions of displeasure that have come from pseudo-patriots and spurious Christians. The truth, of course, will be opposed and denounced by the abettors of error. But they cannot alter its divine nature — nor lessen its power. It will be truth still — and it will prevail.

I will thank you to send me a copy of your oration.

A few weeks ago the young men of this place invited me to give them a lecture. I did so. The custom of war was my theme. My sentiments were received more generally with favor than I expected. Some of my hearers, however, were very much disconcerted, and assailed me in the newspapers; and made such misrepresentations of my address that I caused a copious abstract of it to be published. If I can get a copy I will send it to you. Affectionately yours,

SAMUEL J. MAY.

FROM NATHAN APPLETON.²

PITTSFIELD, August 11, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — I have received the pamphlet which you were kind enough to send me, and have lost no time in reading it.

I admire the eloquence, power, boldness and truth which it contains. I admire the spirit and grace which run through it, but I cannot go with you the whole way. I believe much may be done to check the spirit of war, to modify its character, but I do not believe that it can be abolished. I believe in the law of *force*, and that human nature as now constituted (and I have no faith in a radical change) can be governed by no other. I should be very unwilling to rely on simple abstract justice, without force to back it. I cannot think it would be safe to leave our harbours unprotected, and to rely for safety on the character of non-combatism. I believe the same rule of war which makes a private ship good prize at sea, would seize her lying at the wharf in port, and I should be very apprehensive for the safety of merchandize in the neighbouring warehouses.

I agree to all you say about the folly and wickedness of going to war for Texas and Oregon, and should hope that it may have some

¹ (1797-1871.)² (1779-1861.)

effect in taming the mad lust for war so predominant in our country. The book will be extensively read — both in this country and Europe — and will I trust lead to deep reflection upon the whole subject, and I should hope produce some good result. It is sometimes necessary to “cut beyond the wound,” and perhaps it was your idea to go for the whole in order to get half. I am inclined to think a certain degree of war necessary as a part of the system of Providence. Occupation is necessary to man. It is difficult to see how he could find sufficient employment without occasional war or preparation for it. In this country, to be sure, we shall have enough to do for a century or two in converting the wilderness into fruitful fields and populous cities — but what shall we do then? Would not the mass of unemployed wretchedness in Europe be increased if the army and navy were turned loose to seek a support by labour? — already such a drug in the market. It is a matter to think about. If you will make us a visit we will talk it over. After a parching drought we have at last an abundant rain, never more wanted. A few days of our country air will I think be useful to you, and our beds are now all unoccupied. Come. Very truly, Your friend,

N. APPLETON.¹

FROM ANDREWS NORTON.²

MY DEAR SIR, — I admire and heartily sympathize with the fine, independent spirit of your oration. I regret one passage where, an allusion unnecessarily particular, it seems to me to have carried you too far.³ But you address men as they ought to be addressed, as intellectual and religious beings. Your picture of the evils of war, of the horrible atrocities with which it is often accompanied, of the bad principles and feelings existing in both parties by which it is often produced, of its frequent uselessness, and of the enormous burden which it has imposed on human industry, are very striking and effective. You present facts which as regards the progress of civilization and human improvement cannot be too deeply impressed on the minds of men.

¹ Sumner's reply is in Peirce, II. 375.

² (1786-1852.)

³ “Some of us have heard, within a few short weeks, in a Christian pulpit, from the lips of an eminent Christian divine, a sermon in which we are encouraged to *serve the God of Battles, and, as citizen soldiers, to fight for Peace,*” etc. The sermon was delivered before the Ancient and Honorable Artillery Company by Alexander Hamilton Vinton. In his *Works*, Sumner (I. 56) mentions Vinton, but in the original issue of the oration he devoted much of an appendix to the opinions of this minister.

I might stop here, or rather I might write this over again, striking out the second sentence, and send it to you as a true expression of my thought and feelings. Such it would be, but not the whole truth, and to this as a man of sense and principle you are fully intitled. You ought not to be, and you would not be satisfied, I do not say with a mere compliment, but with the most honest praise, if you believed that there was something kept back which the writer might say to another, though he would not say it to you. Especially would such a communication be most unsatisfactory from a friend.

I will therefore go on to say, that I do not agree with you in all your positions, and in treating a subject which admits of so powerful an appeal to the universal feelings of humanity, in relation to which indisputable truths may be urged with so much effect, it seems to me that one should be particularly on his guard not to weaken the effect by assuming any positions which are untenable. Let us see then where we differ.

You admit that life may be defended at the cost of life. You approve of employing an armed force against pirates and slave-dealers. You will not question that the true end of government, so far as regards the administration of criminal justice, is to protect its subjects from injury and violence from those who are disposed to commit wrong; and that in doing so it must employ force; and that this force, if resisted, must involve the right of taking life. Without this right it would be inefficient, since criminals might easily reduce the government to the alternative either of taking life or of suffering them to escape. You do not adopt the quaker principle that force is not to be employed in putting down evil, which principle stated in proper terms is this, that the whole physical force of mankind, so far as men act directly on one another by means of it, should be delivered up to the injurious and violent, to those who are certain to make the worst uses of it.

On what point then do we differ? On this. I conceive the end of government to be not merely to protect its subjects from injuries that may be inflicted by individuals within its own limits, but from injuries that may be inflicted by individuals of a foreign nation acting under the orders of the government of that nation. If it be the office and duty of a government to do so, this duty involves the right of war. The principle on which the use of force is justified in this case is the same on which its use is justified in any other. Defensive war, therefore, cannot be condemned on principle. But you contend that in the present state of the world no war can be a defensive one. This is saying, in other terms, that the governments of the different civilized nations (for to them the proposition

must be confined) are at the present day so influenced by moral principles and feelings, that no one of them will make an unjust attack by force on any other nation however defenceless, that they none of them entertain a disposition to wage an aggressive war for some supposed national gain. In considering the character of defensive war, there can, I think, hardly be a question of principle between us. The only question must be of fact, in regard to the present state of the world, in which I wish with all my heart I could better agree with you.

It seems to me to have been a common error of those who maintain the great interests of humanity as regards the preservation of peace among nations to confound together the character of aggressive violence, and that of the resistance to such violence, which, though they are wholly unlike, is the more easily done, because such resistance, like the aggression itself, implies the infliction of suffering and death. But we have a right, as you admit, to defend life at the cost of life. I would add, that there are other things better worth defending than life. There are essential interests of our race of more importance than the lives or sufferings of many individuals. For these the patriot or the lover of his kind will not shrink from suffering or death, and all honor is his due and will be paid him. War may have its high virtues as well as its fearful atrocities — the virtues of self-sacrifice.

But you say that it is wholly and in every form inconsistent with Christianity, being forbidden by the express precepts of our Lord. You must observe, however, that the precepts have no specific relation to war, that they relate to the conduct of individuals towards other individuals, and that they command in the strongest language entire irrisistance to every form of injury, to blows and to robbery. Understood as you understand them, they are irreconcilable with the principles you maintain, and lead necessarily to those of the Quakers.

But these precepts, which when thus understood embarrass the Gospel with a most serious and irremovable difficulty, are when properly understood among the most striking proofs of its authenticity and of our Lord's divine mission. Like many others in his discourses, they were not precepts of universal obligation, but addressed to his immediate disciples, to those who by being, or by becoming, his followers were to expose themselves to be hated and persecuted — "so that he who kills you shall think he is doing God service." Into this world of enemies they were to go forth to teach, to convert and to reform it. Nothing could be more inconsistent with this, their great duty, than to have undertaken to vindicate their private rights or to repel in any way the injuries to which they would be continually exposed. Instead of being preachers of the

Gospel, if not in words yet by their lives — instead of making converts of other men, they would have been engaged in a perpetual quarrel with them. These circumstances were most peculiar, and high and peculiar virtues were required of them. They were to make a sacrifice of the common rights of our nature. Who else but a teacher from God could have made such a requisition from his fellows? Who would have imagined it to have been made if it had not actually been so?

The precepts concerning irrisistance are of the same class as those in which our Lord directed his followers to take no thought for the morrow, to give up all regard for their worldly concerns, to sell all that they had and give it to the poor. And as regards their reference to a then existing and peculiar state of things, they are analogous to many others in the Gospels.

Here I must stop for my own sake as well as yours; for it is more than three months since I have written so much at a sitting, I might almost say since I have written so much. I have not the least doubt that you will take in good part what I have said; and I trust you will feel assured of my sincere sympathy in all your exertions to serve and improve your fellow-men. With great regard, Dear Sir, Yours

ANDREWS NORTON.

CAMBRIDGE, Wednesday, 13 Aug., 1845.

CHARLES SUMNER TO ANDREWS NORTON.

Thursday Evening, [August 14, 1845.]

MY DEAR SIR, — Next to the gratification of receiving an entire assent to opinions, closely and conscientiously cherished, is the satisfaction of knowing that they have been read with care and candor by a mind like yours — at a time too when the weakness of unconfirmed convalescence would amply excuse any apparent indifference to them. I thank you very much for the thought and time you have been willing to bestow upon what I have written, and particularly for the important communication of your views — which I value more than any phrases of mere praise.

I hope that I shall not seem too strongly imbued by the Spirit of Controversy, if I recur for one moment to one point in your letter.

You say that it is the office and duty of a Government to protect its subjects from injuries inflicted by foreign nations, and *that this duty involves the right of war*. I have thought much and anxiously upon this point, without being able to see my way to your conclusion. *This duty clearly involves the right to redress*; precisely as any

wrong received by an individual involves a right to *redress*. But how is the redress to be obtained by nations? Precisely as it is obtained by individuals; not by a resort to *force*, but to *justice*, through the decision of an Arbitrator or a Congress of Nations. He would be thought a madman who should assault his neighbor in the street, in order to determine a question of territory or right.

My argument against war is entirely independent of the texts of the Gospel. I place it on the parallel with the Trial by Battle and the Private Wars of the dark ages; and I submit that the same principles which condemn those outrages, in the relations of individuals, equally condemn war. It seems to me impossible to imagine a question between two Christian nations which shall not arise out of a claim of right, asserted on one side and denied on the other. If this be so, it seems to follow, that *Force* can never determine this question.

With this review of the subject I might have ended the discussion; but I chose to go further, and to consider what I called the *prejudices* by which war is sustained. One of these is the belief in its *necessity*. Under this head I submit, that, in this age, *Arbitration* is an all-sufficient remedy. At this very moment, when war threatens from Mexico, why not refer the question in dispute to a third power? There is no Christian power that would not rejoice to act as Umpire? But the people and Government will not refer it. This is precisely the ground of my complaint. They are so inflamed by the war spirit, that they recognize no peaceful mode of obtaining justice. It is for this reason that I deemed it my duty to speak. I hoped to shew that war was not a *necessity*; nor can I regard it as a *necessity*, unless it can be shewn — 1st that there is no third power who will undertake the duty of arbitration, and 2nd that the good to be gained by war is greater than the evil it will inflict; and, under the last head, I cannot but express my doubts, whether any conceivable good, in our age, would be worth a war.

Another *prejudice* to which I alluded was the opinions of the Christian clergy. I founded no part of my direct argument on the Gospel; but I felt it my duty to meet, so far as I could, the prejudices, as they seemed to me, by which war was sustained, by a mis-interpretation of its texts. If I have erred, therefore, in this part, it seems to me that my main argument still stands. Perhaps, it would have been more prudent in me to avoid all allusion to a topic that seems to be removed from my ordinary inquiries. But, on careful reflection, and under the advice of friends, I felt that I should fail in frankness and truth, if I hesitated to express opinions on that point, which have been the result of study for years. It was in the autumn of 1835 that my attention was specially directed to

the point, whether *Christianity did not forbid all war*. Since then I have read various discussions on both sides. I am not aware that much has been added to the argument in favor of war, since the ample review of the texts by Grotius, in his great work, which I confess he has done with the learning of a theologian and a civilian. Dr. Lieber in his *Political Ethics* has espoused the same side. But the exhaustive argument of Dymond¹ seems to me to displace all the considerations which are urged by both these writers. Dymond takes up all the verses. His conclusions were sustained by Mr. Grimké² of South Carolina, and seem also to have the sanction of Dr. Wayland in the pithy passage from his *Elements of Moral Philosophy*, which I have quoted in my Appendix. I have read Dymond carefully; and *I cannot answer him*; nor have I ever seen any answer to him.

The conclusion that *Christianity forbids war* seems sustained by the historical argument of Mr. Clarkson in his affecting review of the opinions and conduct of the Christians during the early centuries.³ It has also been adopted, after much discussion, as the platform of the American Society; and it was substantially adopted by the Great Peace Convention from different Nations in London in 1843.

It was, then, on my own intimate convictions, and the concurring testimony of so many minds, that had devoted so much attention to this question, that I felt bound to express the opinions that I did. I hope that I did not err; but as I have already said, an error on this point would not disturb my main argument.

If I am right in regarding war as similar in principle to the private wars and trial by battle of the dark ages, it seems difficult to suppose that any true glory can be won on its fields.

As I cast my eyes over these sheets which I have blotted with a rambling and diffuse letter, I feel uncertain whether to send them or burn them. If I should send them, I feel that I may count upon your candid appreciation of the motives which impel me to the support and illustration of a principle, which I have not been able to present to your mind as strongly as I could wish.

Believe me, with sincere gratitude for your kindness, very faithfully yours,

CHARLES SUMNER.

¹ Jonathan Dymond (1796-1828), author of *Inquiry into the Accordancy of War with the Principles of Christianity*, 1823.

² Thomas Smith Grimké (1786-1834). In 1834 an American edition of Dymond, with notes by Grimké, appeared in Philadelphia.

³ Thomas Clarkson (1760-1846). He published in 1817 an *Essay on the Doctrines and Practice of the early Christians as they relate to War*.

P. S. In illustration of the interest which I have taken in this question for many years I may mention an incident of a peculiar character. While in Paris in the winter of 1838 I became acquainted with M. Victor Foucher,¹ one of the King's *Avocats Généraux*, at that time engaged on an extensive work on the *Droit International*, which he fondly hoped would supersede other treatises on that important subject. In the most flattering manner he invited me to peruse the early part of his MS., and to offer such criticisms as occurred to me. After a careful examination of the MS. I returned it to him with a long letter in French (he did not understand English) in which, among other things, I particularly called his attention to a principle which he lays down in his *Prolegomena*, and which he derives from antecedent writers, that war is a natural and necessary mode of determining disputes between nations. I submitted to him the great good he might accomplish, if, first among writers on this subject, he branded that principle as false, and declared war to be monstrous and wicked, as a mode of determining justice between nations. How far he listened to my suggestion I know not, for he never acknowledged my letter, nor has his book been yet published.

Afterwards in Germany on another occasion, when called upon to inscribe a motto, I wrote, "*pacisque*" *imponere morem*.

I know you will pardon these personal details, which your kind letter seems to invite. Wedded to this subject so closely, and devoting myself to it with the single hope of doing some good to my fellow-men, it is not without pain that I have become aware of the mis-representations, not only of the press, but of some, whose intelligence and whose relations to me render their course not a little strange. I have been charged with a violation of decorum in urging what I did on 4th July, as if the day which is devoted to the commemoration of our national greatness is not the fittest occasion to consider earnestly the best means of advancing our national greatness. I have also been charged with an attack on law and order! I attack law and order! My whole argument is to extend the dominion of law and order — to apply it to Nations, as it is now applied to individuals.

But you will tire under this *reduplication* (not the Attic reduplication, you will think!) of a letter, and I can hardly pardon myself for this assault upon your patience.

C. S.

¹ Victor-Adrien Foucher (1802-1866). He never completed this work on international law.

FROM PELEG WHITMAN CHANDLER.¹

HARPSWELL, ME., August 15, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — On my arrival at Brunswick from the White Hills, I found a copy of your oration, which I hastened to run over, and now I am reading it deliberately and thoughtfully. It is in every respect a remarkable production, and I find myself converted to many points of your faith, whilst in respect to some others I differ with your *definitions* more than with your *doctrines*. Thus, I think your statement of the definition of war, although legally accurate, comes short of the truth; especially of *defensive* war. And this definition being wrong, I find less difficulty in disposing of your argument against *all* war than I otherwise should. I cannot admit the doctrine that a nation as well as a man may [not] properly resist aggression, having done all in its power to prevent it; nor can I shut my eyes to the fact, that with nations as with individuals there have been cases of aggression, wicked, inexcusable and outrageous, where resistance was lawful and right. If a man spits in my face, I may, with the Marshal of France, wipe off the dishonorable stain, but what if he proceed deliberately to kill my wife and children before my eyes?

But I prefer to read the whole oration before entering upon the discussion. Allow me to say, however, that many points which struck me as untenable, appear in print more reasonable and are carefully guarded. As to the style and diction of your speech, they are admirable. I shall proceed to burn all the remaining copies of my oration on my return.² It is fortunate for us, who have delivered orations, that we are able to help our vanity by finding fault with your *sentiments* — this Achilles' heel is really consoling!

I think your statement of the principle by which men should be governed as to the code of honor, the best by far that I have ever seen. At least it has had more effect on me and I have reflected upon it very much. You know I am quite disposed to meet combatants on their own field and fight them with their own weapons; and I have often resolved that, if in Congress, I would meet any man upon proper occasion, in the way he might desire. But no one can read your views without being irresistibly carried away by the soundness, the elevation and the purity of the course you point out. Still my mind in this respect is rather in a transition state. [*Conclusion of letter is lacking.*]

¹ (1816-1889), president of the Common Council at the time of this celebration, and best known for his *American Criminal Trials*.

² *The Morals of Freedom*, delivered, July 4, 1844, before the authorities of Boston.

FROM JAMES RUSSELL LOWELL.

ELMWOOD, August 16, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — I thank you for your able and excellent oration, the reading of which I have just finished. It has given me unqualified pleasure, and will surely win for yourself in larger measure than ever the friendship and respect of all good men.

I do not doubt that it will encounter opposition and ridicule, and that the Newspapers (those bloodhounds of a Pagan public Sentiment) will be let loose upon it, and I hope that it will be so. All that truth needs is to attract attention, and for this prime element of her success she is generally indebted to her enemies.

The cause in which you have so gallantly embarked has always been very dear to my heart. If you will look at my "Prometheus" and some verses I wrote on the death of Dr. Channing in particular,¹ you will find that I have not neglected to say my word and take my side upon the question.

I only regret that you should have deemed it necessary to disavow any opposition to the use of force in supporting human governments. But I am willing to leave you entirely to the influence of the principle you yourself have advocated which will inevitably lead you to a different conclusion. *All* force is weak and barbarian, whether it sheds blood, or locks the doors of prisons and watch-houses.

With feelings of warmer esteem than I need commit to the cold keeping of a sheet of paper, I remain Your friend,

J. R. LOWELL.²

FROM WENDELL PHILLIPS.

NATICK, August 17, '45.

DEAR SUMNER, — I have just got your Oration and read it immediately of course, glad all along that the thing had been done, and with an undertone of rejoicing that you had done it.

As I closed the last page, I could not help thinking how far ahead you had strode of the C. S. of '32 and '33, and wondering, at the same time, whether I had been all that while seated still, playing with pebbles?

I hope not. 'T is a good thing, nobly done, and will make your name dear to many whom you will never hear of. Probably you

¹ Riverside ed., VII. 105, 286.

² See his letter to Longfellow, August 13, 1845, in *Letters of James Russell Lowell*, I. 97.

know this already, as its high position will have attracted to you many a kindly eye, which never greeted you before.

I went with you in almost every thing — here and there margining *ad hoc quære*, which should we ever be thrown together on a desolate island or in a post chaise I might get time to talk to you about.

I note the limitation and *protestando* of the introductory letter,¹ still, though not a Non-resistant, it puzzles me to see how in the light of the New Testament (Overcome evil with good, etc.) it is wrong in the U. S. to pun[ish] John Bull, and right in this City of Boston to send a poor drunkard over the bridge to pick oakum — or how, in strict principle, R. Island cannoning down the Dorr rising differs from Philip II. doing the same (or trying to do it) to the Dutch?

Don't you agree with me that this old maxim underlies the whole philosophy of penalties and imprisonment — that man should never, like land, cattle, cotton, be made the mere *means* to an *end*, but always himself share largely in the *end*. *A* is never to be imprisoned merely in order that *B* and *C* may be secure: but the morally insane *A* is to be cured, so surrounded with moral influences as to develope his higher and bring under his animal propensities — this the State *owes* him. Restraint is to continue till this is effected, and to be used *mainly* that it may be effected, and, this being the first or one of the first objects of it, its being accompanied with security to *B* and *C* is thus reconciled with your and New Testament principles — overcome, etc.

But art not thou wiser than I? So good bye and Believe me very truly yours,

WENDELL PHILLIPS.

I take the liberty of asking that if convenient and you have an ample number, you would send a copy to one of the ablest and most devoted peace men in the State, the Editor of a peace paper and a fine man, whom the news of your 4th July delighted, Adin Ballou,² Milford, Mass. I ask it knowing, that if not perfectly convenient, you will refuse as frankly as I ask.

¹ "Allow me to add, that I wish to be understood as restraining my opinions precisely within the limits which I have assigned them in these pages; and particularly to disclaim the suggestion which has been volunteered with regard to them, that Force may not be employed, under the sanction of Justice, in the conservation of the laws and of domestic quiet. All good men must unite in condemning, as barbarous and unchristian, the resort to external Force; in other words to the arbitrament of War; to *International LYNCH LAW*; or the great *Trial by Battle*, to determine justice between nations." This letter is not reprinted in Sumner's *Works*.

² (1803— .)

I see the last *Emancipator* is out, as might have been expected, against Mann and Howe. Is the writer Hildreth? He rides in that troop.

FROM EDWARD KENT.¹

BANGOR, August 17, 1845.

DEAR SIR, — I acknowledge with great gratification the receipt of the copy of your Oration, which you did me the favor and honor to send to me. Ever since I read some of the attacks upon it, at the dinner, I have felt a great desire to read it, for I felt assured that it contained sound truths and startling facts, judging only from the agitation of the *plumes*, produced by the *breeze* you had raised. Permit me to say that I have been greatly instructed and interested by the perusal, and that I deeply feel that you have done more than yeoman service in the great cause of human brotherhood and universal peace, and added to your well established reputation as a scholar and civilian, I have felt more gratified by this bold and unflinching advocacy of the great doctrines of peace, because the views you have expressed are many of them such as I maintained and advanced in a lecture before our Lyceum last winter, delivered at the request of the Managers. I am glad to see those views presented to the public with so much learning and ability and distinctness. The leading idea of my lecture was that Christianity was a religion of peace — that its great aim and object was to bring and establish peace — peace between nations, between man and man and *in* the individual man; that unlike all other religions, it discarded in a great degree, all outward forms, ceremonies and prescriptive observances; that it dealt very little in statutory and positive commands, as to the outward act on any matter, but would bring about its great results by operating on the mind and heart of individual man, convincing, persuading, and purifying by appeals and motives and doctrines addressed to the reason and the affections and not relying upon commanded observances or abstinence. I applied this view to the question of temperance, but particularly to the Christian doctrine of peace. That although there might be no absolute and statutory command, that no Christian should ever engage in war or fightings, as a badge and distinctive mark, like the opposite command of Mahomet, yet the great doctrine was there, and would yet work out its legitimate results, when men understood and felt the force and excellence of the precept — Love your neighbor, and love your enemy. My hope is in individual man and with all the dangers and fears attending the extension of the democratic

¹ (1802-1877), governor of Maine (1838-1840).

idea, I feel that the great central truth of equality and the worth and power of the individual is essentially a great antagonist of the war spirit. For as the *individual* rises, the *captain sinks*. Would not this idea be a good ground work for a popular tract by some *real democratic friend* of Peace, and an offset to the popular tendency to idolize heroes, showing how war is the very opposite of the true democratic idea, and how perfectly the individual is sacrificed, both pecuniarily and morally and politically, by the war spirit and warlike preparations and actual war.

There is one point touched upon in your oration, which, as a practical matter, deserves the serious consideration of the friends of Peace. I have never yet, as the good folks say, "seen my way clear" to advocate the entire dissolution of military force in the State. It seems to me, that a government, without any command over physical force to execute laws, suppress insurrections and maintain the supremacy of law, is an anomaly, and destitute of one essential element. I have no fears about foreign invasion. But what can a government do, without some organized force to call upon in domestic insurrections, riots or resistance? We have had recent and painful evidences of the tendency of men to let temporary excitement or interest or passion overcome all reverence for law and all respect or obedience to authority? It seems to me that the entire disbanding of all physical force is impracticable, at least at present, and until men better understand and obey the great doctrines of peace. But there certainly cannot be any necessity for continuing the old, vexatious and cumbersome militia system. If some practical man would devise a scheme by which, under the name of armed police or militia, a sufficient force for all domestic exigencies could be kept organized and sufficiently trained, and properly located for service, he would, in my judgment, do a good service to the cause of Peace. I know that the difficulty I have indicated is one that is felt by many, and if it could be removed, there would be a very general acquiescence in the abandonment of the old system. But above all things keep the cause of Peace out of the hands of the crazy headed fanatics and fighting and furious advocates, who have neither toleration for dissent, or patience with prejudice, or the calm and enduring spirit of Peace, but who would alarm with their radicalism, the timid conservative, and overthrow with their blind rage the best schemes of reflecting and common sense philanthropy. Excuse the freedom and length of this hasty letter, and believe me, Very respectfully yours,

EDWARD KENT.

FROM THEODORE SEDGWICK.¹

NEW YORK, August 18th, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — I have read your Speech with great pleasure. I have heretofore read Jay's War and Peace,² and my mind like that of every other person of ordinary intelligence in the County has been turned to the Peace Movement. Yours is certainly one of the ablest, most interesting and most ornate discussions of the subject that I have seen. You flatter me by saying you hope for my concurrence. To a certain extent of course I concur. No one can fail to admit War to be a terrible evil — an unchristian, extravagant, brutal enormity. But in the present stage of the world as to the other branch of your theme, the abolition of our defences, military and naval, to be candid with you I should just as soon "abolish the defences" of my House and sleep with unbarred windows and open doors. Our recent aggressions on Mexico, the atrocious conduct of England in China seem to me pretty tolerable indications that it is not yet safe to go *in puris naturalibus* and trust to the humanity of the gnats not to sting us.

As to the whole subject it seems to me we are yet far from your most desired consummation. War is only one kind — and to my notion not the most abominable kind of *Force*. It is War or the main spring of War — Force which keeps down the millions of Europe at the starving point. It is *Force* which maintains the selfish upper classes of England in their luxurious ascendancy — Force which with the help of four hundred thousand bayonets upholds the mongrel Monarchy of France — Force which stays the crumbling throne of the Pope and enslaves the descendants of the Roman. There are to my mind worse evils than war. I looked through your pages with earnest eye to find some lessons for England and could have wished that after scourging *Decatur* and impaling Dr. *Vinton* you could have found a few words for the Wellingtons, the Marlboroughs and in general for those warlike, aggressive, violent and overbearing Children of Bellona. But you let them pass unscathed. You see I write you with the frankness of a friend, and tell you in what respects I differ. But for the high toned morality, research, refinement and learning of your oration I am altogether your Debtor. "*Don't give up the Ship!*" Yours Ever,

THEODORE SEDGWICK.

¹ (1811-1859.)² William Jay (1789-1858), who printed in 1842 *War and Peace; Evils of the first, and a Plan for preserving the last.*

FROM HENRY CHARLES CAREY.¹

BURLINGTON, August 18. [18]45.

DEAR SIR, — I am indebted to the kindness of our friend Mr. Binney,² for the perusal of your excellent discourse on the True Grandeur of Nations, from which I have derived so much pleasure that I am desirous to offer you my thanks for having placed before the world in so attractive a form views so important to the happiness and prosperity of mankind. I have, in my way, done what I could to promote the dissemination of similar ideas. In years past, I have, on various occasions, endeavoured to shew that the true way to secure the maintenance of peace was “not to prepare for war,” but to permit labour and its products to be applied to the promotion of the growth of wealth, by which we should become, from day to day, large producers and consumers, and thus more and more necessary to all nations, who would therefore find it almost impossible to quarrel with us. The really “cheap defence of nations” is not to be found in stars and crosses, titles and orders, but in abstaining from everything that can in any manner tend to produce a claim for such absurd distinctions.

Louis Philippe — to whom you are disposed, as I think, to allow far more credit than he deserves — has amused himself, during the whole period that has elapsed since his accession to the throne, with trampling upon all the weak of the earth, from Abd el Kader³ and Queen Pomaré,⁴ Buenos Ayres and Chili, to Portugal and Switzerland, while from the U. S. he has quietly pocketed an affront far more serious than that which produced the deposition of the sovereign of Algiers, and all the subsequent atrocities consequent upon the War in Algeria. The simple reason was that he could not afford to quarrel with us. To do so, might have cost him his crown.

England will do — and has done — more to conciliate us than she will do for any other power. The U. S. are the only one that can undertake, with any hope of success, to set limits to her power on the ocean, the only one that can say to her that the days of Order in Council, paper blockades, rules of '56, and impressment, are over. In the London *New Quarterly* for July, is an article upon the absolute necessity of maintaining the mercantile marine in full

¹ (1793–1879.)

² Horace Binney (1780–1875).

³ A celebrated Arab chieftain, born about 1807, near Mascara, who from 1832 preached a holy war and finally surrendered (in 1847) to the French general, Lamoricière.

⁴ Pomaré IV, queen of Tahiti, during whose reign the French assumed a protectorate over the kingdom.

efficiency, as a means of providing at all times a full supply of men for the military marine, yet the author admits that the U. S., without either Army or Navy, "abrogated the navigation laws" as fully as "by resisting the right of search on the high seas they dealt the death blow to that vexatious and presumptuous claim." Here is an answer to his whole argument. We have done that which all the navies and armies of Europe could not have done — compelled England to set bounds to her assumptions of power on the ocean. The breaking down of the right of search is a triumph of peace over war. It is a proof that the influence of nations, like that of individuals, is increased by good conduct, by the maintenance of peace, and by permitting their citizens to employ themselves productively, instead of requiring them to strut about in parti-coloured clothes, with muskets in their hands. While other nations have impoverished themselves by supporting large fleets and armies, preying upon themselves when not employed in robbing and murdering others, we have thriven because we have pursued a different course, and have grown in half a century to be the only power that can face Great Britain. Whoever desires to see this Nation attain to that point when the declaration "I am an American citizen" will ensure to every man entitled to make it the fullest regard to all his rights, should desire to see an end to war and preparation for war — to all Armies and fleets, except so far as indispensably necessary for police. All this is so fully shewn in your excellent discourse that I wish most sincerely it could be distributed — by hundreds of thousands — throughout the country. A neat edition of it might be made, that for large quantities would not cost more than two cents, and I am sure that many persons here, beside myself, would gladly contribute towards the cost of it, uniting with the friends of peace and free government in your quarter, in extending the belief that the happiness and security, the real grandeur, of nations, can be promoted by obedience to the greatest of all the Commandments, and by that means alone.

Your book is not even for sale here, or rather in Philad'a. I spoke of it yesterday to my friend Chandler,¹ of the *U. S. Gazette*. He had heard of it, and would be glad to read and notice it, but he must first *see* it. As I could not get a copy for myself, I was unable to tell him where he could find one.

Some years since, probably while you were abroad, I published a work the object of which was to shew the Harmony that prevailed throughout the laws of Nature that regulate or influence the relation of man with his fellow man — when properly considered.

¹ Joseph Ripley Chandler (1792-1880).

Ricardo teaches that the landlord owes his wealth to the constantly increasing difficulty of obtaining food. Mill, that this difficulty must go on to increase until starvation must become a regular and legitimate mode of keeping down the numbers of mankind. Malthus and McCulloch deem it inexpedient that a nation should be dependent on any other nation for grain, and would limit the population instead of increasing the supply of food. All of them hold that the interests of the labourer and capitalist are opposed to each other, and that profits can rise only at the expense of wages, and *vice versa* that the wages of the labourer can only increase at the cost of the owner of capital. According to all of them, mankind are little better than a parcel of wolves, preying upon and worrying one another. Believing that such could not be the case, I was induced to a careful examination of the laws of the production and distribution of wealth, and at length satisfied myself that the want of harmony was only apparent, and that the real interests of all were precisely the same, that with the increase of capital there was an increase in the return to *both* labourer and capitalist, although the former obtained a constantly increasing *proportion*, leaving to the latter a constantly diminishing *proportion*, as marked by the diminution of the rate of interest, yet to *all parties* there was an increase of *quantity*.

The direct effect of this law of distribution is the tendency to improvement and equality that is observed in all nations in which the growth of wealth is *permitted*, because permission only is needed. The tendency to equality is greatest where wealth grows most rapidly, as in the U. S. and particularly in New England, where every factory girl may, if she will, be an owner of factory stock. It may be repressed by law of primogeniture and other contrivances, as in England, but the Reform bill and the steady progress of popular control, shew that equality is advancing. Physical improvement cannot take place without that increase of the machinery of production which is a consequence of the growth of wealth. Moral improvement cannot be looked for where physical condition is low. Intellectual improvement is a consequence of improved morals. Political improvement — equality of rights — is a consequence of all, and is promotive of all. All improvement flows from the increase of wealth, and wealth cannot grow without peace.

The result at which I arrived was that all political economy was to be found in the single sentence "Do unto your neighbour, as you would that your neighbour should do to you." Respect in him the same right to security of person and property, and opinion, that you would claim for yourself. If legislators and politicians could be persuaded to see this great truth, the whole duty of the political

economist would be limited to that of recording the errors of past times, as a beacon to all future legislators against a repetition of the thousand impertinent interferences with the laws of nature, by which the growth of wealth and the consequent improvement of man have been prevented. He would have to caution his readers against the race of "great" men — men who earn that title by endeavoring to compel those around them to do as they would have them, instead of following their own ideas as to their true interests — such men as Napoleon and Louis, and Jackson, and Colbert, etc., etc.

By the first opportunity that offers I will send you a copy of the book, to care of your publishers, Mess. Ticknor & Co., and request your acceptance of it as some return for the pleasure I have had in the perusal of yours. It contains views that are original — if they have no other merit — and they are supported by facts drawn from all parts of the world in all periods of time, with a view to shew that they are universally true — as, if not so, they have no better claim to be deemed "laws" than those offered to the world by Ricardo-Malthus, which are opposed by the great mass of facts. The "laws of Nature" are always simple — so are my doctrines — and as such is the case, they may perhaps be true. Excuse me for trespassing upon you with this long epistle, but when a man is fairly mounted on his hobby, he does not always know when it is time to dismount. I am, Dear Sir, Yours very truly and respectfully,

HENRY C. CAREY.

FROM SAMUEL ATKINS ELIOT.¹

August 19, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — I must attempt to reply to your note which I have just received, though you would excuse my omission to do so, because I think you are in danger of doing *me* injustice, by putting my objection to your discourse on wrong grounds: You have not quoted my last remark to you the other day with verbal accuracy. When I stated my quasi-official objection to the delivery of such opinions, in such a manner, on such an occasion, arising from my recollections of duty as a public agent, you quoted the present Mayor's approbation of your course as authority against my view, and I then said, "You must console yourself with his approbation instead of mine." This was merely to rebut the high estimate you seemed to have of the opinion of the present incumbent, which seemed to you a sufficient answer to my argument, (for I gave you the *reason* of my opinion,) and you answered me with his *authority*,

¹ (1798-1862.)

when it did not appear from any thing said that my objection had ever occurred to his mind. The reason of my saying any thing which had a savor of harshness was this endeavor on your part to treat his authority alone as equivalent to my authority combined with an argument. I confess to some degree of annoyance habitually, when an authority is quoted to me in reply to an argument, especially when it is no breach of modesty to believe that my *dictum*, as such, is entitled to as much weight as that which opposes it. I do not consider the 4th of July as a military occasion at all, but I regard the City Celebration as a sort of literary banquet, (at least it should be,) to which persons doing the drudgery of office during the year, or who have done it in past years, are *invited*, with the expectation, of course, that nothing rude or offensive to them personally shall meet their ears. I consider it just as uncivil to invite a man to that celebration and then wound him by adopting a subject, or a mode of treatment of a subject, known to be disagreeable to him, as it would be to invite him to your own house, and then serve him in the same manner. When people assemble by invitation as to a meeting which is to be regarded as a favor, and is looked to as a pleasure, they have a right to expect to be treated courteously, and not to have the pursuit of their lives held up to an intense degree of odium and scorn, to have every injurious epithet applied to their profession, and the prejudices of their lives rudely assailed. Persons who wish to reform should not, in my judgment, make violent assaults at any time, certainly not on such an occasion, where common sympathies should be addressed and excited, and pleasant feelings only aroused. Doubtless a great sensation may be produced by such a proceeding, but it must inevitably be at the risk of losing a reputation for good judgment and civility, which to me would be far more valuable, if I could gain it, than the applause of thousands of excitable and enthusiastic persons. There are "the opinions of which one outweighs a whole theatre of others." You cannot doubt, and you could not have doubted, when you chose your subject and your style, that every military man present must be offended; and every military man was there *by invitation*, and had, therefore, a claim which should have been, in my judgment, sacredly respected, to be treated in a manner not justly offensive. You can scarcely doubt that those who venerate our fathers will be deeply wounded by the sort of forgiving tone you assume toward them, and every subscriber to Bunker Hill Monument displeased at seeing that battle ground alluded to as a Golgotha. I do not accuse you of hastily adopting opinions for the sake of bringing them out in a striking way. I have no doubt you have entertained them for years. Nor do I doubt in the least that members of the

City Government might suggest to you the topic; but I think it was for you to consider its appropriateness, and to have forbore to press views not in harmony with the occasion. And as a peace man I cannot but regret the tone of the production; but I presume you will find great numbers who will agree with you, and differ from me, on that point; so I will limit my objections to that which I stated the other day, and which I now repeat after having deliberately read the whole. As to the ability and copiousness of information with which the subject is treated, I presume there can be but one opinion, which must undoubtedly be highly satisfactory to you, and I greatly wish that to the other merits of the work there had been added the grace of appropriateness, that you had remembered, "how many things by season seasoned are to their right praise and true perfection."

Notwithstanding all this fault finding, I am quite satisfied that what I think your error, is, if it be one at all, only an error of judgment, and that you are perfectly conscientious in all you have done. Neither have I any doubt that you will find ample recompense for my censure in your own right intentions, and in the loud and numerous plaudits which await you from those who sympathize with you not only in opinion but in temperament. But you cannot expect to command the applause of *all*, and having chosen the side of the enthusiastic and ardent, you must allow those to differ from you who do not expect to work faster than the Almighty, and who have no belief that reforms are best promoted by violence. I hope your oration will be one of the steps by which the cause of peace will advance, and that it will not prove, like the measures of the professed abolitionists, an obstacle to the progress it seems designed to aid. Withal I trust I shall be allowed to remain where I have long been, among your true friends, for I am very Sincerely Yours,

SAM'L A. ELIOT.

If I were criticising your oration, I should object to your urging so strongly the renunciation of means of defence, before a tribunal competent to try and *punish* delinquencies was established. The trial by battle and ordeal continued to be practised long after the establishment of courts and juries in England; and it was doubtless frequently a protection against wrong, and therefore better than no trial at all. And so it must be with national war. The competent tribunal of nations must be securely established before you can possibly expect wars to cease. But this is a view in which you are countenanced by many peace men, and I merely express an opinion, valeat quantum. Excuse blunders arising from haste and interruptions.

FROM RICHARD HENRY DANA, JR.¹

August 22, 1845.

DEAR SIR, — I have allowed some time to elapse since you did me the kindness to send me your oration, because I did not want my note to fall upon your table, one among the hundreds of every day, which you have had, congratulatory, expostulatory, condemnatory, and laudatory. I have not only read it with great interest, but taken a good deal of pleasure in watching its effect, as shown by the Cerberus of the press.

It is a fair subject for congratulation whenever a man is made, or makes himself to feel that he is exerting influence upon his fellow men for what he thinks to be good. How it breaks up ennui and gives spirit and purpose to life!

Surely, you have accumulated the horrors of war in a way that no one can escape being affected by. It will make all who read it join more earnestly than ever in that solemn litany which goes up constantly, as it has for ages, the world over, in every tongue, "from battle and murder and from sudden death, Good Lord deliver us." "Give to all nations of the earth unity, peace and concord."

I had read Dr. V[inton]'s sermon and needed no ghost to tell me that he was making a forced and fantastical use of a plain sentiment to support his theory. The truth is, he is infected by the Genevan and Protestant fashion of relying upon single proof-texts, expounded according to what is called, by compliment, private judgment. The true question is, what is the *whole gospel*, the *faith and practice delivered*, upon this subject.

The criticism in the note is very neat and able, but I was most sorry, grieved, to see the turn of expression with which the critic (who I suppose is a Unitarian, or rather Humanitarian) begins the first paragraph on the 101st page.² I believe I do not mistake the feeling of people when I conjecture that more persons will be offended by that than by anything in Dr. V.'s sermon. It is common to fall into an error of interpretation, and even a false view, which has names of innumerable good men to support it, is pardoned, but a want of reverence we are apt to think an indication more dangerous. I know the purpose of the critic was to make a *reductio ad impossibile* — I refer to the manner of doing it.

It is not for me to speak of the ability of your performance. You will hear of that from better judges. But I may say that I was

¹ (1815-1882.)

² "If Christ meant what the paraphrase makes him to imply, he was guilty of a dishonest trick; a jesuitical playing with the ambiguities of human speech."

struck with the manifest earnestness, sincerity and humaneness of feeling. Nor can I help alluding to the picturesque and dramatic effect produced. I left it with distinct pictures and images of scenes, persons and places in my mind, and feel as though I had seen and acted in some great and terrible crises. How rare this power is, in a writer! Long drawn descriptions, full length portraits, studied images and figures — none of these will ensure it. In a professed epic or romance, art may attain to it, but I believe that it cannot break out, unawares, in a work of different description unless there is earnestness of feeling to set fancy on.

Neither am I capable of controverting your positions; but I must say I wish you had read a little, or a good deal, in that class of writings I spoke to you of. I shall not be satisfied until the whole subject of the “use of force, under Christianity” is taken up together. The parent punishes the child, by a painful and degrading infliction on its body, though this body is a “temple of the Holy Ghost,” though the child is made in the image of God, and its angels are beholding the face of our Father in Heaven. The state declares what it believes to be justice. This is the law. For an offence against this law, the state punishes the citizen, by confinement, by want, by disgrace, and even by death. And where capital punishment is abolished, yet *force* is the sanction of every law, force, even if it end in riot and death. All this under Christianity! I confess I should want as clear a warrant from on high to lead a fellow creature silently and alone to the gallows, with force to prevent rescue, as I should to lead out the British army from “Belgium’s capital,” or to fire upon a mob in the city of Brotherly love. These things do not differ *essentially, in principle*. It is not on the principle of deciding which is right, as by lot, that we go to war. We must know that we are right first. I take it that war is an act of the state, punishing strangers for a violation of a generally recognized law of nations, just as it punishes its own citizens for violating its municipal laws. Property and liberty are first aimed at, and life only is the extreme sanction.

It is only on the principle that the same God who punishes violations of His laws in this world and in the world to come, has established His kingdom upon earth, and has committed unto men a certain duty of carrying out the principles of His government here — it is only as the vicegerents of the Most High, that the State has any right to use force upon citizens or strangers, or the parent upon the child. It is thus that Holy Scripture says, “the powers that be are ordained of God, . . . for the *punishment of the evil* and the reward of the good,” and for this purpose “*they bear not the sword in vain.*”

The sword of justice, that is, the right and duty to use *force*, is committed to the State, in a less degree to the parent, and to some extent, in certain emergencies, to the individual. If this confided force is used unjustly, it is a sin, and is punished, or punishable by the Most High. It is a sin to bear the sword for private ends. Is it not also a sin to "bear the sword in vain"?

But it is foolish in me to open this deep subject. Its depth is sublime, its comprehensiveness immeasurable. And I am on a sheet of letter paper — a fit example of human attainment, is it not?

I am truly glad you give yourself to such a subject, and with such success. Let me join my congratulations to the host of those you are receiving, with all sincerity, Yours truly,

RICH'D H. DANA, JR.¹

FROM WILLIAM JAY.

BEDFORD, West Chester C'y, 22 August, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — A few days since I returned from New Port, and found waiting my arrival a copy of your late address which you had kindly forwarded to me. That evening when the family had retired, I carried the pamphlet into my study and sat down to the feast you had provided. Mrs. Jay, awakening after midnight and missing her husband, arose to seek him and learn the cause of his absence. She found him engaged with the address, and lecturing him on keeping such bad hours, vainly attempted to send him to bed. The address, Appendix, notes and all, were finished at one sitting. And now, my dear Sir, I have much to thank you for. Of course self-love would naturally admire any production which offered so much to gratify personal vanity, as your very partial remarks respecting myself. For the friendly feelings which prompted those remarks accept my sincere acknowledgments. But far other than personal considerations lead me to rejoice in this address. The high moral courage you have exhibited, the elevated principles you have advanced, the important facts you have spread before the community, your powerful arguments expressed in strong and beautiful language, together with the wide and salutary influence your effort will exert, all combine to swell the debt of gratitude which you have earned from your fellow citizens. That debt I well know will be *repudiated* by many, and very partially paid by others; but you will find a rich reward in your consciousness of well doing, in the esteem of men whose esteem is valuable,

¹ Sumner's reply is in Peirce, II. 377.

and above all in the approbation of Him whose favour is better than life.

One of the greatest beauties of the address, if I may so speak of a negative quality, is its freedom from *demagogism*, that endemic moral plague of our country — a plague with which we are cursed above all other people on the face of the earth. A remarkable case of this vile disease you will find mentioned in the enclosed paper. You will recollect that when we last met, talking about the prison discipline Society, I promised to send you a letter I had written in vindication of the Pennsylvania system. I now discover I did not retain a draft of that letter, and in its place I send you one about the Vicksburg murders. It is but justice to Mr. Dwight to state, that in his reply he condemned and regretted the passage on which I had animadverted and declared that it was admitted into the Report through inadvertence. With sentiments of sincere and cordial regard, I remain, dear Sir, yours truly,

WILLIAM JAY.

FROM THOMAS GREAVES CARY.¹

August 23, '45.

DEAR SIR, — I am obliged for the copy of your oration. I have read it with great interest; and am sorry that you did not deliver it a year sooner, as it might have saved me the trouble, and, as you think, the folly of aiding in an attempt to sustain the militia. In my simplicity, I had supposed that it was rendering a useful service to the republic by preserving a safeguard for the execution of the laws. You do not seem to me to have proved the reverse to be true, nor to have given correct estimates of the cost or the effect of the system, notwithstanding what Mr. Jay says. But you present the subject in close connection with other statements so forcible that I expect to see new discredit thrown upon the "National Guard." The burlesque of *Col. Pluck*, which I think led to the audacity of the late riots in Philadelphia will probably be renewed; and, if the country will have it so, I have no objection to take my chance, as other people must, of Lynch law, anti-rent murders, and Dorrite rebellions.

You present an admirable criticism on the misuse of Dr. Vinton's text; but it would come with more force if you had, in your own address, enlarged upon the whole of our Saviour's injunction instead of confining yourself to that portion of it which suits your present purpose. If we are literally to "turn the other cheek"

¹ (1791-1859.) See 1 *Proceedings*, XVIII. 166.

rather than resent a blow, we are equally bound to give up the "coat" after the "cloak" is taken; and yet, I presume that you are, still, ready to commence an action of trespass, when the facts will sustain one, instead of advising a client to quiet submission.

I observe that, after remarking on the misuse of language by others, you coolly prepare to charge off upon "your nature" any failure to act thoroughly on principle. Yet it seems to be well established that we are all as much bound to thorough performance of duty as if we were ordained clergymen.

Queen Pomaré, now, and the Tyrolese, in the time of Napoleon, would probably dispute your assertion that there can be no war purely of self-defence in our age.

It would probably have required but little alteration in the performance to make every position, that you need occupy for the end in view, almost impregnable; and I should suppose that this would have rendered it more effective and useful, by inspiring confidence in the practicability of what you propose.

You can safely disregard all this pecking at you, however. You have undertaken so good a cause, and have made so strong a statement of it that your oration is likely to make a lasting impression by encouraging the friends of peace and increasing their number.

After so much crime and misery from our side, it seems safe to cheer you forward on the other; which I do, and am, Dear Sir, Very truly yours,

THOMAS G. CARY.

FROM NATHANIEL LANGDON FROTHINGHAM.¹

25th August, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — On getting home from a journey last Thursday evening, I found your promised oration on my table, and have given it already one careful reading which I propose soon to repeat. In thanking you for it, and for your kindness in thus remembering me — which I most heartily do — I am sure that I shall not be suspected of any intention to pass more compliments if I say that I hardly knew which to admire most in your discourse, its lofty sentiments or its splendid literary ability. I probably agree with you further than might have seemed from the playful conversation we had together the other day at Mr. Longfellow's table, though I should still plead for "another handle to the cup," and put in a claim for the great Nemesis, that you would hardly be willing to admit. To your leading principle I with all my heart

¹ (1793-1870.) See *Proceedings*, XI. 371.

assent. The greater part of your positions seem to me absolutely impregnable. But I apprehend I might differ from you in some of their inferences and applications. As I am writing, however, only to thank you, I will say no more about the matter; more especially as I should be in danger of running into an essay instead of scribbling a note of acknowledgment, if I should begin to enlarge upon it. Perhaps I shall have the pleasure of talking it over with you one of these days.

I will only tell you at present of one little point that has rather amused me. As we sat together at dinner you spoke of the non-resisting method of quelling dogs; a very sensible way, which, though no Ulysses, I have both practised and recommended. It so chanced, that I was at that time regaling myself with reading Owen's new edition of the *Odyssey*; and a few days after our talk, came to the passage in the 14th book. Now, thought I, I have found an excellent illustration of Mr. Sumner's doctrine, which I shall not fail to acquaint him with. On reading the Oration, however, I perceived that it had not escaped you. Indeed, he must be a shrewd gleaner that could pick up anything where you had been through. But now for *my* side of the matter, and in the name of the goddess aforementioned. According to Homer's account if the "godlike swineherd" had not plied his brickbats pretty sturdily, his master would have been likely to flutter more rags than he brought with him, in spite of his pacific ingenuity. Moreover, we read at the close of the book that Eumæus himself, on setting out from home, had the precaution to take with him a sharp javelin, *ὄξυν ἄκοντα*, which is declared to be a good defence against *dogs* and men, *κυνῶν ἀλκτῆρα καὶ ἀνδρῶν*.¹

Believe me, my dear Sir, Very sincerely yours,

N. L. FROTHINGHAM.

FROM BRADFORD SUMNER.²

BOSTON, August 27th, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — I received a few days ago, a copy of your discourse, which you were kind enough to send me, delivered on our last national anniversary. I thank you for it, and have great pleasure in saying, that the sentiments it contains, are in accordance with my own, and are such, as I have long entertained, and advocated, as I have had opportunity. The address will doubtless be exposed, for a time, to the assault of a few redoubtable ones,

¹ *Odyssey*, XIV. 531.

² Died 1856, "an honorable and upright lawyer of the Suffolk Bar."

among us, who talk in "swelling words" of wars, and battlefields, and military prowess, and who are most valiant where there is no danger; but those flippant criticisms will soon give place, to the sober, better judgment of the many.

The discourse after all that has been said, and will be said, will do you good. Its doctrines are founded in truth, and will prevail. It is *now* spoken of, as an expression of independence and moral courage, highly creditable to the author. I have not made these few remarks from any apprehension, that you need a kind word from any quarter, but as an avowal of my concurrence, in the sentiments you have advanced, and so well sustained, not by arguments and illustrations drawn from supposed cases, which are not always the surest test of truth, but from facts, and events, as they are before us, and pass under our own observation. But I have said enough, and perhaps too much. Yours Respectfully and Truly,

B. SUMNER.

FROM CHRISTIAN EDWARD DETMOLD.¹

NEW YORK, August 29: 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — If I have not written ere this to thank you for your kindness in sending me a copy of your Oration it is simply because I did not read it until within the last few days. Immediately on its receipt it was taken possession of by the ladies, who passed it from hand to hand until at last it was returned to me. From them it has elicited with one accord a hearty approbation and a sincere admiration, and for myself I can only say with them, that in you a noble cause has found a most noble advocate. In fact you did me but justice in supposing that I would appreciate it and rejoice with you at the excellent effect which this happily timed and admirable exposition of the absurdities of war, has produced.

I believe the general feeling of the respectable portion of the American people is decidedly opposed to any war, except it be a defensive one. War is desired *only* by reckless speculators, ambitious lieutenants and greedy army contractors. Despite of the infinity of rumors daily set afloat by that class of men and alarmists, and the magniloquent vapping of Mexico, I don't even believe in war with that power on account of Texas — and as to war with England on account of Oregon (which our friend Falconer² so conclusively proves to belong to England) I have not the least

¹ (1810-1887.)

² Thomas Falconer (1805-1882), author of *Oregon Question; Statement of British Claims to Oregon Territory* (1845).

shadow of apprehension. "Le jeu ne vaut pas la chandelle," and in this supremely utilitarian age that is an important point to be regarded. However a few days now must settle the Mexican matter, when all my most confident calculations and anticipations may be blown to the winds.

From our friend Fay¹ I have not heard by the last steamers; our decision (Cogswell's and mine) in his affair with the Harpers, of which I sent you a copy, was not satisfactory to him, and caused Mrs. F. to write me a most singular epistle, which I'll show you, when I am fortunate enough to meet you, as also a copy of my letter to him explaining at length the reasons that brought upon us the conviction that he was in error. I expect to hear from Fay by the steamer now about due. How is your health now? I trust it is entirely and permanently restored. Still you must not presume upon it by burning too much of the midnight oil. And how is Prof. Felton?² The Doctor joins me in friendly greetings to him and to yourself. Very sincerely Yours,

C. E. DETMOLD.

FROM JACOB HARVEY.

NEW YORK, August 27th, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER,—I have been very remiss in not sooner thanking you for the copy of your 4th of July Oration, which reached me several days ago, but I wished first to give it a careful perusal, before writing to you; and one thing and another prevented me from enjoying this pleasure until very lately.

Having been born and educated a Quaker perhaps you will not think a favorable opinion from *me* as of much weight, as you would naturally imagine that I was merely giving an expression to my ancient feelings. I will, therefore, say that I hail with the most lively pleasure the addition of such an advocate on such a Day, to the most glorious of all Causes!

I have always, from my earliest youth, taken the views of War which you have so ably and minutely set forth in this pamphlet, and I have hoped to see the time, when men in public life would become convinced of the truths therein stated, but so degraded is the *science* of politics, in our day, I despair of seeing the initiatory steps taken by any *politician*, the movement must come from such gentlemen as you, who mingle in public life, but are not in place, who can preach *out* of pulpits and *to* men of the world, without

¹ Theodore Sedgwick Fay (1807—).

² Cornelius Conway Felton (1807–1862).

being accused of mere Clerical Cant. Next, I wish to see our leading Reviews take up the subject, and advocate your side of the question—a public opinion would then be formed among those who have not hitherto paid much attention to the *religious* part of the question, and finally politicians would be forced to yield to this public opinion.

I have not seen your pamphlet advertized here and know not where to get another copy, or to tell my friends where to procure them. Please give me the needful information, as many of the Society of Friends are anxious to obtain a copy. You have of course sent Lord Morpeth¹ a copy. I fear, with all his own good feelings, that you are some years *too soon* for him. I mean for any *practical* use of your doctrines. When did you hear from him? David Colden saw a good deal of him in London, he was extremely kind to him and Judge Kent.²

I write in the midst of office bustle in that most noisy street, Wall Street, therefore please excuse brevity and blunders and believe me, Yours ever faithfully,

JACOB HARVEY.

Has your brother returned yet? Come and see us at Hyde Park.

FROM JOHN JAY.³

NEW YORK, Sept. 5th, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER,—Nearly three weeks since I wrote you a letter in acknowledgment of your noble oration, but by some unhappy mischance it was lost in its passage by private hand from Bedford to this City. I hope you have been kind enough to attribute my silence to accident or mishap, and that you have not thought me insensible to the power and beauty of your pamphlet, or to the kindness which afforded me an early copy.

I read it twice attentively—once to myself and afterwards to my wife and the rest of the family at Bedford, and I can scarcely tell you of the delight and admiration with which I lingered over its pages. It is I think by far the most complete, the most overwhelming argument that has yet been advanced against the cause of war, and I marvel how in the little space of time that had elapsed since I saw you in Boston, and you said a word or two at parting of the theme which you had then just selected, you have

¹ George William Frederick Howard, seventh Earl of Carlisle (1802–1864), known after 1825 as Viscount Morpeth.

² William Kent (1802–1861), Royall Professor of Law, Harvard University.

³ (1817–1894.)

exhausted so great a subject, and have brought Mythology and History, Philosophy, Poetry and figures to illustrate the glorious truths which come from your soul as from an overflowing fountain. I had hoped to have been present at its delivery — a proud occasion for your friends, and I now regret more than ever that I was detained at home; for beyond the pleasure of such a discourse from your lips, “speaking to the ear like music,” and to the conscience like the voice of Truth, I should have rejoiced at the sight so seldom witnessed in our land, of one standing up in the midst of a great multitude, and disdainful of “popular noises,” impressing upon them with the fearless eloquence of conviction, the folly and wickedness of their darling idols.

I look with confidence for the happiest results in the enlightenment of our nation from the diffusion of your oration. Among the gentlemen to whom I have loaned my copy is Capt. Newton of the late steamer *Missouri*, who has been passing the summer near my father's. He was forcibly struck by it, and expressed himself warmly upon the subject.

I am very sorry to see by the papers that Judge Story¹ is seriously ill. I trust that the statement is exaggerated and that he may long be spared to you.

I have read in part with great interest Longfellow's Poetry of Europe. The Historical Sketches have given me much information, with which I had never met elsewhere. I have to-day sent a copy of the work for my Mother² to Mr. Andrews,³ the American Consul at Malta, who was attentive to the family during their stay in the island. I observe the illustrated edition of Longfellow is nearly ready at Philadelphia. If the excellence of the illustrations is at all proportioned to that of the poems, it will be a work unsurpassed by any in our motherland. I learned with deep regret from the Boston papers some time since that Mr. Hillard's⁴ strength was much reduced by the warm weather. I sincerely hope he has recovered. Pray remember me to him and to Mr. and Mrs. Longfellow. My pleasant visit to them at Cambridge recurs to me very often. How is their beautiful boy? My wife⁵ and children are still at Bedford where I heartily wish you would pay us your long promised visit. Always, Faithfully Yours,

JOHN JAY.

¹ He died September 10, 1845.

² She was a daughter of John McVickar, a merchant of New York.

³ William W. Andrews, of Massachusetts, appointed in 1834.

⁴ George Stillman Hillard (1808-1879).

⁵ Eleanor, daughter of Hickson Field of New York.

FROM BENJAMIN DOUGLAS SILLIMAN.

NEW YORK, September 8, 1845.

You mistake your vocation, my dear Sumner. You should be a soldier and a general. The bravery which led you to declare such doctrine on such a day would secure to you laurels and arches. In *robur et aes triplex* you surpass the old sailor. On my return a day or two ago from the Court of Errors (at Rochester) I found the address which you were so good as to send me. I have read it with *admiration* of its learning, courage and eloquence. I read it aloud to the family the other evening. Its effect was to transform us into "a house divided against itself." It broke us into three parties — one fraction with my mother at the head being rank *Summerites*, and concurring in your whole proposition and in the expediency of the address being delivered on the 4th July; the Naval branch of the family (I have two brothers in law now on cruises) and a Navy Surgeon, who was present, pronouncing it utopian, its statistics inaccurate, and its conclusions unsound, while I, like Eldon, *doubted*.

I owe you and Judge Jay a grudge. You have robbed me of one of my most cherished pleasures — that which I derived from military history. I am in the "transition state." You have both demonstrated the wickedness and brutality of war, but you are both too fast for me in the way of conclusions, for I can't think it safe to turn swords into ploughshares until all sword-holders will agree to do the same, and I can't doubt that wars will occasionally be inevitable until the Millennium puts an end to the passions, cupidity and injustice of man. Your address will I am sure do great good. It will strengthen the sentiments which already lead all decent men to deprecate the *ultima ratio*. Those terrible statistics which bristle thro your pages will furnish at the next session of Congress an argument more potent than principle to dissuade from a campaign against Mexico in behalf of slavery.

I suppose that Ruggles told you all about our friend Kent who is enjoying his visit very greatly and has received attentions from many of the high and might (from your friend Lord Morpeth especially) which were unexpected and gratifying.

I have taken the liberty of giving to young Mr. Foster,¹ a student of mine, letters of introduction to you and to Mr. Greenleaf.² He was graduated (a year ago) at the head of his class at Col[umbia] College, is studious, clever and ambitious. He is a very moral, gentlemanly and ingenuous youth and will I trust secure your

¹ Jacob Post Giraud Foster (d. 1886).

² Simon Greenleaf (1783-1853).

esteem. He is a brother of F. Foster who married Miss Emily How. His father is a rich retired merchant, and the young man aims to make himself a lawyer in the best sense of the term. He goes to your Law School in pursuance of my earnest advice, and if you will favor him with a suggestion as to his expedient course while there I shall be greatly obliged.

I rejoice to see by the papers, that there is reason to expect Judge Story's recovery. Why, why, why does he resign? ¹ He cannot so long as life lasts have an adequate excuse.

I hope to see you here this summer. Will you not come in the course of the autumn?

Remember me warmly to Hillard, the Dr. and the Prof. and believe me always and sincerely yours,

B. D. S.

FROM HORACE MANN.

CONCORD, September 8th, 1845.

MY DEAR SUMNER, — I have very carefully read your Oration, and that part of it, which I suppose you considered the pith of the argument, I have read twice. I assure you, too, that I have read it with my mind in as open and receptive a state as it is possible for it to be. There are parts of it — indeed, by far the greater part — which express the noblest spirit, in the noblest words. As to the argument, I wish you had stated your propositions, both a little differently, and a little more clearly. From the brief conversation we had the other day, I think we should differ but little; but you have not stated the case so clearly in the oration. You speak of war as universally unjustifiable, and it is only some time afterwards, that you restrict the doctrine to Christian nations. This early declaration, and later qualification of it, tends to disaffect the reader towards the reception of the general doctrine.

But I can put two cases, palpable and present ones, which I think refute the *universality* of your position. They are those of the Poles, and the negroes at the South. I can feel no hesitation in saying, that if there were only an even chance of succeeding, I think both those people would be justified, before the holiest tribunal, for declaring and waging even the most exterminating war — or indeed, for waging without declaring it.

Your definition of war may be the legal one, that it is “a public, armed contest between nations, in order to establish justice between them.” But this is not a fair definition of a class of wars that have

¹ Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, II. 521.

arisen, and, for aught I know, may arise again — such as the war of Holland against Spain, or the war of the American Revolution, or the last war of the Poles, if it may be so called. It is not to establish justice, but to repel injustice, to resist a party who cares nothing for justice. In such a case, your great analogy — the trial by battle — has no relevancy. If a man attacks me, or threatens to take the life of my wife and family, before my eyes, I cannot appeal to the trial of battle; or, even, to the laws of my country. If I wait for that, the wrong is done and is irreparable; and altho there may be some who would be restrained from making the assault because they knew, or if they knew, that I would not repel it; yet there are others who would perpetrate it for that very reason. Now I cannot doubt that if Great Britain had no fear of resistance from us she would do to us what she did to China; and that I hold to be good cause of war.

When aggression is not violent, and immediate danger does not demand immediate resistance, propose mediation. I agree to that. Take every step possible to avert so great a calamity; but if all prove unavailing, then I cannot refrain from saying, FIGHT! You maintain that such overtures *would be* successful. I think you have no right to say that. If it be true, then it is sufficient for your purpose to establish the argument that mediation, etc., should always precede war; for, if always to precede war, and always to be successful, then your point is reached. But another man says they may not be successful. What right, in logic, have you to cut him off from that *postulatum*, in regard to a future event? But I have said more than I intended to against your Oration, and not so much in its favor as it deserves.

In regard to the war of 1812, you state the case so briefly as not to state it fairly. The claim of Great Britain always has been that, *in time of war*, she had a right to reclaim her own subjects wherever found. When Congress declared war against her, she was daily practising on that claim. Subsequently she made peace with all other nations, and relinquished her practice, or would relinquish it, under the claim. Our government therefore waived the condition which they would have insisted upon, had terms of peace been proposed with us, *pending a war by her with another nation*. They said, if she *acts* on such a claim hereafter, we will meet the action when it comes; but we will not continue the war for an abstract principle. It was part of the arrogant title of the British king for centuries that he was king of France. How foolish in France to have *declared*, or *continued* a war, to make G. Britain renounce a title that led to nothing. But suppose G. Britain had attempted to carry out that claim — the offensive acts under it, not the claim

itself — would have been good cause of war. So while she *acted* under an asserted right to board our ships, and take any American citizen away whom she saw fit to kidnap, we justly interfered in behalf of those citizens, but when a new state of things arose, and it was understood that the claim was in *abeyance*, then our government consented to peace.

What an awful strapping you have given Mr. Vinton!! Don't never say anything more to me, about my love-pats to the Boston schoolmasters. Yours very truly and sincerely,

HORACE MANN.¹

FROM THOMAS HOPKINSON.²

LOWELL, September 8, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR,—I received a copy of your oration with the sign manual of the author, which makes it a precious book to me. As to the matter of the oration, I congratulate you on having made a *sensation* in a 4th July oration. *Hic labor; hoc opus* — and to have accomplished it is *success*, decided and sufficient. This is the point of view in which I regard it as a fourth July oration.

As a literary composition I read it with unqualified satisfaction. I see the old style, the old hand and mind. But it is ripened, condensed, filled up with flowers and fruit, ripe scholarship grafted on a thoughtful mind. Many of its passages rise into eloquence of high order.

As to the general sentiment, I cannot get my hopes of human nature up to the hope, not to say belief, that the nations will have war no more. The future seems to me fraught with war. The world in which my boys will live (and it is their world that, at *my time of life*, I most think of) I believe will be an era of the sword, an age of steel. Where do you see the progress of peace principles? True we do not see wars — in this breathing time, this truce of the ages. But do we not see one of the nations whose war establishment forms the least conspicuous part of her institutions, giving that mortal offence which would amply justify a "*defensive war*"? Were I a Mexican, nothing but a sense of impotency would prevent my taking the stump to raise the war fever. Did not the world just witness the arm of the most enlightened and philanthropic nation on earth, uplifted with the might of war, to avenge the cause of smugglers engaged in forcing a poisonous drug into a nation against the wholesome restraints of its government? What may we hope when power thus stalks over the rights of the weaker?

¹ Sumner's reply is in Peirce, II. 377.

² (1804-1856.)

No, my friend, this I fear will ever be [a] militant world, till human nature takes one of the higher phases contemplated by the author of *Vestiges of Creation*. Not a higher *training*, but a higher nature; that must be the change.

But, in the mean time, it was doubtless well to advocate a high standard. The *aliquid immensum, in fructum gerere* is never safer than in questions of morals; and thank you for the rich treat which the *libellum* has afforded me.

My wife wishes me to add that she agrees with *you* decidedly. She believes by enlightening *man as he is*, he can see the folly of war and be brought [to] act for his interest. Aye there's the rub. *Dos pou Sto*.¹ If you can enlighten this being of passion, and low desires! Very truly, Your old friend and classmate,

THOS. HOPKINSON.

FROM ELIZA ROBBINS.²

NEW YORK, September 9th, 1845.

Dickens makes it an American abomination to write upon ruled paper; now I know that Mr. Sumner is quite as fine a gentleman as the author, and perhaps he is so much finer that he will not be overcome with the ignorant vulgarity of the blue lines, which prevent me from writing in a diagonal fashion, that some of the sex never can avoid. Perhaps you have cursed your oration twenty times because so many old women proper — and some in pantaloons — have written to you concerning the same, taking up your good time with small homages. Nevertheless I shall come also among them to assure you that without considering the whole of your argument, or even understanding it *completely*, I am highly gratified by the discourse — regarding it a service to humanity, and most especially honorable to you, proving that you have large and practical notions of justice and mercy, and what is more commendable, and admirable, have none of the fear of man before your eyes, possessing and acting out that very moral courage which brought upon Socrates the sentence of death, and forced William Penn into a pestilent prison-house. But this is a better day. Men have now need of all the virtue and wisdom of any age, but they need not fear the wrong-suffering which once awaited the honest expression of great truths. There is much apathy and selfishness to prevent the free course of such announcements, but there is also in the world zeal for the right — so that it be understood; and generous

¹ Δός που στῶ καὶ τὴν γῆν κινήσω.

² Compiler of a number of books once popular and now forgotten. See Sabin, *Dictionary of Books relating to America*, xvii. 341.

sympathies are cherished in many hearts for those who have power and opportunity to set it forth. The mere exhibition of the true happiness and virtue of mankind — the true “Grandeur of nations,” in the righteousness that exalteth them — will, in God’s own time, batter down all the strongholds of physical force, now sustained by prejudices founded in immemorial practice. Christ did not say to ancient paganism, Demolish your altars, throw down your idols. But it has been done at his bidding — in the spirit of his instructions — that is, it is partly done. So, that other spirit of idolatry — the idolatry of misnamed heroes, and heroism, will give place to forbearance, equity, and benevolence. Only the time of such consummation seems very long deferred to us, because to the Ruler of the universe a thousand years of brief individual humanity are as one day. We cannot see why Man’s blindness and cruelty and wrath should be his ministers, but,

He is his own interpreter
And he will make it plain.

Now perhaps you think I am running into a little fanaticism, but I believe as much in the divine government as in the human agency, and so I cannot separate the one from the other.

Opinion is the power that undermines and overrules all other power. To disabuse the rising race of the war spirit we must infuse peace principles into the common education. I have endeavored to do this in all those little works which in many thousands of copies are, I hope, influencing the young mind of the country. Mr. Bailey¹ of Sheffield in his *Essay on the Formation of Opinions* says, “The only improvement in the condition of mankind that can be rationally expected is their gradually emancipating themselves from the various errors and multiform ignorance in which they are involved. Society commences in barbarism, and it becomes very slowly enlightened: every step in the progress implies the discovery of new truths, or a departure from errors to which it has been accustomed — from notions established and practices consecrated by years.” The truths which might forever confute these prescriptive errors, he continues, require to be “familiarised in elementary treatises, *taught in the schools*, wrought into our lighter literature, and instilled into the minds of the young” before they can be received in all their efficacy. So entirely is this my faith that I have for twenty years felt myself *called* — in my poor way — to teach, “here a little, and there a little,” the very doctrines you have brought forward on one occasion with so much energy and

¹ Samuel Bailey (1791-1870).

concentration. In all my little instruction books, I have never once spoken of "glorious victories," of "immortal heroes," or "conquerors crowned with laurels." No, there are other and nobler benefactors of men, and let the grateful enthusiasm of youth expend itself upon such. I send you one of these books — not used in your popular education, to show you in small measure the sentiments which pervade the whole series. If you will read the article Page 317 to the end, you will see by what seed-sowing I would forestall the false maxims of vain-glory that still corrupt the young. Please also to read from the 178th to the 180th page, and the preface. Then I will discharge you from said book — which if you give it to some boy that is now fed with worse compends may do him good.

In Albany I went forth with the Discourse in my hand to the Book store, and enquired if there was a Peace Society there, or any people professing such principles. My friend Holley¹ hearing me, answered, "None — they have no principles that I ever heard of." He read the Oration and has written the margin all over with good words. Dr. Dewey² is greatly delighted with it, and Mrs. Kirkland, a most intelligent reader, is enjoying it highly. "Thank God," she says, "he is no older."

Your patience having been thoroughly tried, I conclude, Respectfully,

ELIZA ROBBINS.

I am ashamed to send so shabby a book, for the later ones are more sightly, but I have this at hand.

FROM CHARLES TIMOTHY BROOKS.³

NEWPORT, September 14, 1845.

DEAR SIR, — In asking your acceptance of my Poem,⁴ I have an opportunity to do what I have been for some time intending, namely to thank you for a copy of your noble Oration, which I found waiting for me, when I returned home. I have read nothing of modern production which has moved me so much for some years. It provokes one to love and good works greatly. I am not, however, quite satisfied of the duty, or right, of the better part of a people to omit making military or some kind of force-preparation against assaults which the worser part (is that a good word? it sounds right) of a people may by their madness have provoked.

¹ Orville Luther Holley (1791-1861).

² Orville Dewey (1794-1882).

³ (1813-1883.)

⁴ Pronounced before the Φ. B. K., at Cambridge, August 28, 1845.

In showing that such and such wars are not really defensive, e. g., for avenging national honor or recovering national damages (in which I agree with you) it does not seem to me you prove no possible war defensive. I admit the probability of its possibility grows less and less. I had been accustomed to think (and I have not quite given up the notion yet) that turning the direction of the martial propensity toward the fine arts, e. g., poetry and architecture, was ultimately favoring the cause of peace, and that as a certain cannonading blew up the French Revolution, so by the ingenuity and summariness of military enginery, on a sort of Homeopathic principle, the point of war might be sharpened down till it broke off. I hope, at least, that this is the Providential tendency of things. I am prepared to go with you, excepting as to the abolition of all military preparations, and trust I am open to conviction there. One thing is certain, that, as a Christian, I am bound to do, or by my silence suffer, whatever I do or thus allow, from no lower motive than the largest love of man. But you have reminded me that the laws of love and right stand side by side. On whatever point my opinion may be undecided, I am pretty sure I am personally a peace man and a peace maker. I hope you will not find my poem too warlike. Where it seems so, please consider that I am too much of a non-resistant to battle against my enormous combativeness, but just ease it off into the field of the critical and spiritual contest. Yours in the bonds of the gospel of peace, hope and charity.

C. T. BROOKS.

I have written perhaps too hastily on such a subject and to one who has studied, too, so profoundly, but I am too much occupied to rewrite what is writ.

FROM DANIEL APPLETON WHITE.¹

SALEM, September 16, 1845.

DEAR SIR, — I thank you for sending me a copy of your admirable oration for which I had already honored you in my inmost heart. You could not have taken a higher or nobler subject for your discourse, or one more seasonable and appropriate, and I rejoice that you were able to treat it in so complete and effective a manner. The great principles which you have so powerfully enforced have their foundation in eternal truth and justice as well as in the very essence of Christianity, and must ultimately prevail in the world. I know of no means under Providence better

¹ (1776-1861.)

adapted to hasten their triumph than such exertions as you have now made in their support. Opposition, from whatever quarter it may come, does but the more plainly show the necessity of such exertions, and should serve only to make them more earnest and persevering.

I received your oration yesterday with the more lively gratification, I suppose, from having that moment been reading in the *Daily Advertiser* your beautiful, just and glowing eulogy on Judge Story,¹ which delighted and melted my heart. For this also I thank you most sincerely. With great regard I remain your friend and obedient servant,

D. A. WHITE.

FROM EDWARD JARVIS.²

DORCHESTER, 21st September, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR,—I feel greatly obliged to you for the gift of your oration of the 4th July last. I have read it with attention and interest, and heartily agree with you in the opinions and the sentiments therein advanced.

When I read it, I felt proud that one placed as you were, where your predecessors, with one exception, him of 1842,³ had offered up the incense of flattery to the people, should now dare tell the truth, and expose our national shortcomings, and false notions of national greatness.

It seems strange, that the human mind could have admitted such fallacies, in regard to national dignity and character. In physics the whole is the sum of the parts; and what these are individually, that is collectively. But, in national organizations, no such thing happens. That which constitutes the character and dignity of the nation is very different from that which is esteemed the worthy character and dignity of the individual. The man esteems himself, and is esteemed by others, for his probity, his talent and gentleness. But the millions associated together, esteem themselves for their physical force, and their power of destruction. The man is courteous, patient, forgiving — the nation is overbearing, irritable, quarrelsome.

The man shows to friends and strangers his family — his wife and children — the beauties of his neighborhood, and hospitality. The nation displays to foreigners, its fighting men and its instruments of destructiveness, and the property it has stolen from

¹ Reprinted in Sumner's *Works*, I. 133.

² (1803-1884.)

³ Horace Mann.

others. The man is ashamed of his former lawsuits however successful, and he hides all evidence of his quarrels. But the nation hangs its trophies of battle in its churches and public halls, and even baptizes its ships, bridges, etc., by the names of the scenes of its victories.

The British arms and drums disgrace our Senate chamber in Boston, and the Bunker Hill monument tells to every Briton, that we beat his forefathers there. But if the president of the Bunker Hill Monument association should hang up in his own parlor the evidence of a lawsuit, which he had gained over a neighbor, to whom he had afterward become reconciled, or if the president of the Senate parade the account of his election over his rival, to the public gaze, both these men would be considered as, at least, mean fellows.

Such antitheses might be drawn without end, and all would show, that the individual man is a gentleman — modest, quiet, and honest — but the nation is a bully, a braggart, a puppy. It is snappish and barks on slight occasions. It is boastful of its powers and its achievements, and it is ready to fight rather than yield in matters even of a trifling or a doubtful nature.

No respectable farmer considers his character at all involved in the maintenance of his boundary, which his neighbor, equally respectable, disputes. Still less would he fight that neighbor, with fists and bludgeons, for the sake of his doubtful land. But our nation was ready to go to war with Britons for the N. E. Boundary; and pretended, that its character would be sullied by concessions. And our rulers and people considered, that the national dignity was compromised, if they did not collect its debt of France a few years ago. Though every public officer, who professed these sentiments, would have thought it beneath him to connect such collections with his own personal dignity, or have gone into a lawsuit, at the cost of ten times the debt, in order to collect it. The cry was, throughout the nation, we must not yield! we must fight! and let not the national honor be tarnished!

Your oration will be one means toward removing these false notions of national character. But we want such in every town and every family. The spirit of war has gone before you, and ensconces itself everywhere. The instruments of destruction are in every corner — almost in every home. The men of war, the harlequins claim precedence in every public assemblage. Not even our civil, peace loving governor can go [to] hear the commencement at Cambridge, without the accompaniment of a troop of warriors through the streets, and b[ein]g there surrounded by several of these imitation warriors, on the very stage, amidst the ministers of the gospel, women and literature. I was in hope, that the time had come, when

this vulgar display of the follies of barbarism could be done away. Can not some movement be made to remove this coarse sin? The purification of the commencements is but two-thirds done. Gamblers, and grog sellers are removed; but soldiers perch themselves in high places, and annoy the sensibilities of the refined and the true at every anniversary.

Again, I thank you for your oration, not for the copy merely, but for your public sentiments, for your courage and for the influence that must follow from so good a work. Very respectfully your friend,

EDWARD JARVIS.

FROM ————. ¹

MR. SUMNER, — There are two cases, says Mr. Mann — palpable and present — which “refute the universality of your position” that all wars are unjustifiable. “They are those of the Poles and the negroes at the South.” Waiving the consideration that these are not cases of war between independent nations, but merely insurrections, and therefore not coming within your position”; and considering them *as wars*, how does he show that they “refute your position”? Simply by saying that he *thinks* that “both those people would be justified before the holiest tribunal for declaring and waging war,” etc. Now, whether they would be so “*justified*” is the very question, and is his assuming one side of it to be considered a refutation of your position?

But what is meant by “justified” in this sentence? If Mr. M. had meant that they would be justified according to the common maxims of national policy, or the uncertain and corrupt customs called the Law of nations, there need be no dispute with him — for this is not your criterion; but when he says the “holiest tribunal,” we are authorized to suppose he appeals to the authority of the Gospel; the only “tribunal” we should allow to be “holy”; and then we would ask him in what passage or line of that authority, he will find any sanction to the process of recovering any rights or redressing any wrongs however great by the violence and murders of war? Such was not the teaching of him who, “when he was reviled, reviled not again,” and who declined the aid of “legions of angels” in defence of the holiest cause; such was not the feeling of myriads of martyrs to his name, who yielded their lives without resistance, to the most detestable of tyrants. Is it indeed Mr. Mann, the enlightened, the humane, the philanthropic Mann, who,

¹ I have not been able to identify the writer of this criticism, and no letter in the same writing was found in this volume of the Sumner Papers.

with the Gospel of peace he reveres in his hand, would encourage the political or the domestic slave to march to his freedom through the sanguinary scenes of battle, and the ferocious massacre of his oppressors?

Mr. Mann objects to your definition of war, that it is a contest to "establish justice" between nations; and he cites three wars as a specimen of a class" which were to "repel injustice," "to resist a party who cares nothing for justice,"—these are the wars between Holland and Spain; the American Revolution; and that of the Poles. Here he is again unfortunate in his selections. These, like every other, were professedly for "justice," which each party alleged to be on its own side; and although the leaders might, in their own minds, "care nothing for justice," yet justice was the ostensible object with both; and the charge of insincerity might be made by both, with equal truth. In the trial by battle, each combatant might, and often did, insist that the other "cared nothing for justice."

But now comes the "stereotyped" extreme case of the attack of an innocent man by some ruffian, who threatens to take his life or those of his family, while there is no time to resort to legal protection; and for the hundredth time we have to answer, that such cases are totally irrelevant to the whole subject. Neither you nor I, nor any rational friend of peace denies the right of self-defence in extreme cases of necessity; but public war has no such necessity; a nation can never possibly be placed in the circumstances here represented, of an individual. War never is waged without some *pretence* at least; and almost always is brought on by successive and increasing acts of irritation and hostility by both parties. The idea of a *strictly* defensive war is an abstraction which has no exemplification in history.

But it is said that though some individuals might abstain from an assault on a man because they knew he was defenceless, "there are others who would perpetrate it for that very reason." Now we know the efficacy of the first mode of repulsion from a great accumulation of facts; not a single proof can be given of the last proposition. I never heard of the case. If Mr. Mann believes in it, let him go about armed to show that he is prepared to resist aggression; and see how much safer he will be. But when this doctrine is applied to nations, long as it has been held by them, it is the most chimerical imaginable; and Mr. Mann astonishes me when he says, "I cannot doubt that if Great Britain had no fear of resistance from us she would do to us as she did to China." Does Mr. M. really believe that Great Britain stands in awe of our puny means of resistance? I have heard a great deal about the ambition and

injustice of Britain; but I think cowardice is the last trait that ought to be imputed to that nation. But if she should treat us like China, Mr. M. holds it "to be good cause of war." That is, injury from one set of men, is "good cause" of *crime* in another.

Mr. Mann thinks you have "no right" to say that "mediation" or negotiation to avoid war would be successful. I think you have a right to say so, because wherever they [have] been honestly and fairly tried they have been successful, when employed for the right cause; but if not successful, he then says, "fight." Is he sure that fighting would be more successful? Is he sure, again, that, if successful, it would not cost more than the claim fought for was worth? Now my opinion — which perhaps in this case is as good, as it is founded on a careful search of history — is, that the cases where kind and conciliatory negotiation or mediation would be successful, compared to those in which fighting would be successful, is at least a hundred to one. Of course I do not mean such negotiation as is usually employed — of an angry defying nature. One plain fact has escaped Mr. Mann. Fighting never makes peace or settles disputes. Whichever party is successful in fighting — peace is always made afterwards by *negotiation*. Why not as well before, as after the nations have mangled each other?

In the last page of Mr. Mann's letter, he makes an argument to show that questions between nations need not be settled to avoid war, so long as neither commits any overt act in violent execution of her claim. The war with Great Britain, after all the cost of blood and treasure, did not settle the question; but left it open for an occasion of future war, when one of the parties should think it expedient to enforce her claim. Had there been no war on our part, is it not probable that when Great Britain made peace with her other foes, this question might have been settled by negotiation? when after war, both parties were too proud to give up their claim, or any part. So much for decisions by war. Yours, etc.

[*Unsigned.*]

FROM HENRY THEODORE TUCKERMAN.¹

NEW YORK, September 22d, 1845.

DEAR SUMNER, — I thank you for the Oration you were so kind as to send me; and have read it with much satisfaction. As an abstract moral argument it strikes me as quite incontrovertible. The array of facts and many of the illustrations are certainly very forcible. One of the Boston papers I perceive chides you for the

¹ (1813-1871.)

numerous quotations and authorities cited. In my view this is an agreeable feature of the discourse. There is a perverse conservatism observable in most American addresses which abstains from all allusion to the wise and gifted of the past and seems to proceed on the idea that the world began with our revolution — a piece of narrow egotism unworthy a liberal mind. I think you make out a strong case, but fail to recognize *all* that may be said on the other side. There are many indirect agencies growing out of military and naval establishments which should be taken into account. Besides the intellect and moral nature, life should give scope to *adventure*, and while so large a part of the globe is inhabited by barbarians and such an amount of uncivilized brute force exists, the show and latent influence of armaments and soldier-ship may be an important element of human safety and progress. However, I did not mean to discuss the subject but only to thank you and express my sympathy and pleasure. Please remember me to Longfellow, Hillard and Felton. Very truly yours,

HENRY T. TUCKERMAN.

FROM WILLIAM HENRY FURNESS.¹

PHILADELPHIA, September 26, '45.

MY DEAR SIR, — I thank you for the copy of your oration which you were so kind as to send me; and rejoice in the opportunity of expressing to you the very great pleasure I had already had in that noble word of yours. I find in that oration the spirit, which is the one thing that our glorious New England lacketh. I have visited Massachusetts only twice in the last seven years, and while I have been deeply impressed with the demonstrations of power and progress everywhere visible in my native state, I have mourned over the want of faith in herself and in truth which she evinces. Boston ought to rule the country (morally). To think of such a little decayed English town as Charleston (S. C.) undertaking to wag a single tongue against Boston tries one's patience.² That you have testified so thoroughly to great principles and that Boston has adopted your voice as her voice on so grave an occasion — these are comforting signs. Massachusetts *will* wake to her power. She has only to plant her foot, and she can drag the whole country clean and clear out of those savage *institutions* of the South.

Boston has a great advantage over all other cities. Its citizens are

¹ (1802–1896.)

² A reference to the expulsion of Samuel Hoar from Charleston. See Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, II. 515.

native to the soil and strike their roots down deep into it. It is a homestead, while N. Y. and Phila: are hotels, bar-rooms, congregations of foreigners who are worthy people in their way but possessed of no *genius loci*. We compensate ourselves for expatriation by cherishing our pride in our native places.

If Daniel Webster would only throw himself without reserve or stipulation on great principles of Peace and Freedom, he might go forward with the heart of New England in his hand. And what a baptism it would be for his own soul. It would make an archangel of him. But I sate down to thank you and I am scribbling away as to a familiar friend — pardon me and receive these few lines as a token of my high esteem and cordial gratitude. Very truly and respectfully yours,

W. H. FURNESS.

FROM DANIEL LORD.¹

NEW YORK, September 27, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — Your visit was too agreeable for me not to remember it. But your very considerate notice in sending me your letter respecting Judge Story and your oration are matters not to be forgotten. I am very happy to make my acknowledgments.

With your feelings about Judge Story I heartily sympathize and your letter recalls all the circumstances which ennoble grief at such a loss. The bereavement of his friendship is to you a loss not to be repaired if indeed it can even be measured.

I have read your oration with great pleasure. I agree with your feelings and sentiments on the subject of war, although I am not able to adopt your views entirely of its unlawfulness; it seems to me substantially to embrace the wider and more general question of the right to employ force in the demand or defence of right, as well in civil government as among nations. But every considerate man must delight in every publication and effort, turning the attention to the horrors and crimes attendant on war. The levity with which men talk of war, of its glories, pomp, circumstance and maxims, is inhuman and in the extreme pernicious. The idea of a war for Oregon, or upon a dispute of title is not a whit more reasonable than for two individuals to fight out a disputed question of private title. Your oration leaves one question undecided as to yourself, and that is whether the Law has gained or Literature lost most, by your having embraced the former. But even this time will decide.

Meanwhile accept my thanks for your two papers and remember

¹ (1795-1868)

me in your visits to New York, which I hope may not be infrequent. I am very respectfully your obedient servant,

DANL. LORD.

FROM BRANTZ MAYER.

BALTIMORE, October 24th, 1845.

DEAR SIR, — I have received, partially read, and thank you for your noble Oration whose principles I hope to see adopted by this age. Until this age adopts them, indeed, it cannot be called an age of advancement. The first great law of all progress is Peace.

It has always struck me as supremely *ridiculous* that there should be such a thing as war. Texas and Mexico to the contrary notwithstanding, it is to be hoped that battle *for conquest of territory* is out of vogue. What then remains as cause of war? Is there anything that might not be honorably settled by discussion? Well, you begin by discussion — discussion ripens to insult — insult produces conflict — conflict produces injury, destruction of property, death. The two parties, in fact, strain every nerve to harm each other most effectually, and, after they have inflicted the greatest number of mutual wrongs, they sit down again to conclude by discussion what began by discussion. Is there clearer perception of right and truth in the controversy of two *lame* men than in the interchange of opinions between two *sound* men? Yet such is precisely the result of modern warfare, since the geographical limits of nations have become pretty well defined by the balance of power in the world.

It has struck me that many of the dangers and evils of war might be obviated by *dignifying* the modern character of diplomacy. I do not, of course, allude to the present class of men, employed (with few exceptions) by our government — persons who are pensioned for political vagabondism; but I think that a race of young men of fine talents, astuteness, purity, truth, *humanity*, and high cultivation, might be put aside or selected by the Government, and educated in *your* principles. These young men should be placed in the diplomatic corps with the understanding that it was to be their *career* — not that they were to be employed for a year or two, and then cast aside as useless dangles around the belles of foreign courts, or graceful writers of letters on the patriotic and constitutional refusal of a snuff box. *Let them rise by merit.* Let their merit be the assurance of our *peace* with the Nations to which they are sent and the progress and promotion of all our industrial interests. I do not think I am greatly wrong when I believe that such a body of honest persons would form the cheapest and most rational Standing Army that the world has ever seen.

Pardon me for throwing this dust among your heap of *peaceful* diamonds and honor me by accepting the accompanying little volume which I have just edited for our Historical Society. I am, dear Sir, your obliged Servant,

BRANTZ MAYER.

FROM GERRIT SMITH.

PETERBORO, October 30, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — Many thanks for your letter and pamphlet.

I had heard enough of your speech to give me a sharp appetite for it: and I assure you that the feast has not come short of my greediness for it. I would that a copy of the speech were in the hands of every reading family in this land and in this world.

The speech will not make you popular. It requires a wiser and a better age to appreciate it. Time and truth will do justice to it and the writer of it.

As I expect to be in Boston a few days hence, I hope that I may have again the pleasure of taking you by the hand. With great regard, Your friend,

GERRIT SMITH.

FROM JAMES MILLER MCKIM.¹

ANTI-SLAVERY OFFICE,
PHILADELPHIA, November 11, '45.

MR. CHARLES SUMNER, — I have read and greatly admired your 4th of July Address entitled the "True Grandeur of Nations," and in common with many others in this part of the country desire for it a large circulation. The price at which it is now sold will prevent, I think, the widest practicable circulation, and I write therefore to suggest the propriety of publishing a cheaper edition; and to request of you the favor — if it be not too much of a favor — to allow me the privilege of publishing such an edition.

I am induced to take this liberty, first, from the presumption that you would be pleased to have your work as widely spread as possible, and second from the circumstance that, as it appears, no copyright for it has been taken out. I may add further that I have been in the practice of publishing works of this character, for reasons such as I have mentioned. I republished with his consent and approbation several of Dr. Channing's last public addresses. I may also add, that if I were allowed the privilege of republishing

¹ (1810-1874.)

your work I should take pains to do it in a *neat* as well as a cheap form. Yours respectfully,

J. M. McKIM.

FROM JAMES MILLER MCKIM.

PHILADELPHIA, November 19th, 1845.

DEAR SIR,— I had no idea of the amount of matter contained in your pamphlet, till on the receipt of your letter I sat down with our printer to make — or rather to hear him make — an exact estimate of the cost of publishing it. I found that I had set the cost quite too low. The foot notes and appendix make such an amount of composition that it will be impossible to print a *handsome* edition, or any but a quite inferior one, which I would not like to publish and which would be unworthy of the matter — any cheaper (or at least any to be worth while) than the one that is now selling, without a loss to the publisher. Perhaps one or two friends who are interested in the spread of the “oration” will be willing to aid me in printing a cheap edition at a loss; in that case I will go on with it; but if not, I hope you will excuse me for the trouble I have given you and allow me without blame to decline the undertaking. I should have made my estimate, I confess, before I wrote to you for permission to publish, but I had no idea that I could be so deceived in the amount of matter your pamphlet contains.

Whether I print another edition, or continue to purchase them, as I have been doing, at Boston, I hope to be instrumental in circulating many copies through this region of country. I am with much regard, Yours truly,

J. M. McKIM.

FROM ELIHU BURRITT.¹

WORCESTER, November 19th, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR,— I know that every moment of your time is to the diadem of your reputation a jewel of the first water. But such jewels shine no where else with such benign lustre as in the crown of the PEACE MAKER, the only one worn in two worlds on the same brow. Then, I trust that you will not deem me asking you to throw away your pearls, in soliciting a few thoughts for the January number of *The Advocate of Peace and Universal Brotherhood*. You have been apprised of the fact, that I have taken upon my own shoulders the whole pecuniary and literary responsibility of the *Advocate*, with the view of relieving the Society of a burden and

¹ (1810-1879.)

source of embarrassment, which was fast accumulating a debt upon them. In assuming this charge, I assumed the privilege of applying to the members of the society for aid in filling the columns of the magazine with original matter. I want to bring out something worthy the cause, and honorable to the literary talent of its friends, in the January no.; and if you could furnish a page or two, we should all be profoundly grateful.¹ I prefer this request with much diffidence and hesitation, knowing that it is asking a great deal of you, and what you would not grant to any periodical of the day. But as the cause of Peace dates principally from your oration, it becomes a "Young America" of yours, and you must in a degree father it. With the most cordial esteem,

ELIHU BURRITT.

FROM JOSIAH QUINCY.²

BOSTON, 21 November, 1845.

DEAR SIR,— I return you the letters you were kind enough to submit to my perusal with many thanks. It is grateful to find the worth and the amiable qualities of our common friend thus appreciated, by congenial intelligences on the other side of the Atlantic. The hearts of both McCready and Lord Morpeth seem to be touched with a true sense of the peculiar merits of Judge Story and vibrate with feelings in unison with his character.

The views of Judge Story³ on your 4th of July Oration are co-incident with mine, and "with the length and breadth of your doctrine as to war, I am compelled to dissent" not less than he. I regard such ultra theories on that subject with complacency and with no disposition to contest or to treat them with levity. They seem to be, as I said to you in conversation, anchors cast to the windward, against the innate propensities of mankind; especially when acting together in a republic. Notwithstanding their strength and consistency, when times of pressure come they will be at least dragged, if not broken. They have the effect to postpone warlike tendencies when occasions bring them into action, and to check or limit their power when in actual exercise. "*Lex Naturae est*," says Old Hobbes' *De Cive*, "*quaerendam esse pacem ubi haberi potest; ubi non potest, quaerenda esse belli auxilia*," and I confess, I cannot perceive how it is possible for peace itself to be permanently maintained, without the right and the power of going to war.

¹ The journal died in 1846.

² (1772-1864.)

³ Story's letter is in Story, *Life and Letters of Joseph Story*, II. 543.

However it was as little within my intent as mental competency to enter upon this great question. I admire your talent and I respect your sincerity and it is not through any disinclination to their success that I am not a convert to your doctrines. Truly and respectfully Your friend,

JOSIAH QUINCY.

FROM ALEXANDER HILL EVERETT.¹

SUMMER STREET, November 22, 1845.

MY DEAR SIR, — I have just read your able and eloquent address. I admire the spirit of humanity and love by which it is pervaded, and if I do not entirely concur with you on the leading points of the doctrines I have no right to quarrel with you about them, inasmuch as the same train of thought was at an early period of my life, for several years in succession the predominant one in my own mind. *Un beau matin* I awoke and found, or thought, myself in the position of the butcher, who had been searching through the whole of his premises for a knife, which he held at the time in his mouth. I now consider the Union, not only as the nearest approach that has ever been made to a Congress of Nations, but as furnishing, for all practical purposes, a complete solution of the problem of Perpetual Peace. It does not seem to be important, or even desirable, that the system, which is substituted for war, should extend over the whole habitable globe, but only that it should prevail between neighboring nations, which, as such, have intimate relations with each other, and are, of course, in constant danger of coming into collision. Our Union already spreads itself over twenty-nine substantially independent states, and when it shall embrace, as in its quiet and regular development it naturally must, the whole continent of North-America, it will nearly preclude the possibility of war. Taken in connexion with the plan of referring to arbitration such differences as may occur with other parts of the world, it may be regarded as forming a nearly perfect system.

Since I took this view of it, I have set my mind at ease on the subject, and have declined signing any of the petitions to Congress, or the General Court, in regard to the establishment of a Congress of Nations. I am glad to see that you recognize, in the inter-leagues of neighboring states, and particularly our Union, an approach to the scheme of international polity, which you recommend. On farther reflexion I am inclined to think that you will consider our system as furnishing all the security for permanent peace that can well be desired.

¹ (1792-1847.)

Excuse the liberty I take in making these suggestions and believe me, dear Sir, very truly your friend,

A. H. EVERETT.

Remarks were made during the meeting by Messrs. BOWDITCH, THAYER, W. WARREN, STANWOOD, MINOT and BOLTON.

N. B. 1789. BOSTON. *Date.* 1780.
 IN Purfuance of a Vote of the Town, passed the
 16th of OCTOBER, 1780, Borrowed and Received
 of the Sum of

of the new Emission, to enable the Town to comply
 with a Requisition of the General Court, of the 25th
 of SEPTEMBER last, to procure Beef for the Army,
 which Sum. I promise to repay said

or Bearer in three Months from the
 above Date, with lawful Interest for the same till
 paid ; the same so repaid, to be equal in Value to
 the Sum in the Judgment of the Committee appoint-
 ed by the Town to determine the same.

Oliver D. Jefferson Town Treasurer.

MEMOIR

OF

CURTIS GUILD.

By WILLIAM ROSCOE THAYER.

CURTIS GUILD died at his home, 124 Marlborough Street, Boston, on April 6, 1915, after a brief attack of pneumonia. Son of Curtis and Sarah Crocker (Cobb) Guild, he was born February 2, 1860, in Boston, where his father then resided in South Street.¹ Having fitted for college at the Chauncy-Hall School he entered Harvard in the autumn of 1877, bringing with him a reputation for high scholarship and general intelligent ability, a reputation which he soon confirmed and extended. At graduation in 1881 he stood eleventh in a class of 194. But he was much more than a hard student. He early joined a squad for military drill which "General" Lister conducted at the Old Gymnasium, and he became one of the most efficient fencers in college. He served two years as an editor of the *Crimson* and was one of the revivers of the *Harvard Lampoon*. He ranked among the stars of the Hasty Pudding Club theatricals, was chosen Class Orator and delivered an oration on the Patriotic Duty of an American. He came out of college well developed in body, mind and character.

On leaving Harvard Guild spent several months in Europe sending letters on travel to his father's newspaper, *The Boston Commercial Bulletin*. When he returned, in February, 1882, he

¹ John Guild, the original immigrant, who settled in Dedham, Mass., about 1640, is supposed to have come from Scotland. Curtis Guild, the Governor's grandfather, graduated at Harvard in 1822 and died in 1849.



MHS

Curtis Guild, Jr.

joined the staff of the *Bulletin*, rising later to be its editor and sole proprietor. He began almost immediately to do service as a citizen, first as a member of the Republican Vigilance Committee in the campaign of 1883, when B. F. Butler was defeated, and then as a worker on ward committees, as a founder and leader of the Republican Club of Massachusetts, in the Citizens' Association of Boston and in the Civil Service League. Being a ready speaker, he had invitations from many States during the great campaigns, his most noteworthy tour being that of 1900, when he accompanied Theodore Roosevelt, the Republican Vice-Presidential candidate, through the West. He presided over the Massachusetts Republican Convention of 1895, and the following year he went as a delegate-at-large to the National Republican Convention (of which he was a vice-president) at St. Louis.

For twenty years Guild consistently refused offers of nomination to political office. But his turn came in 1902, when he was elected Lieutenant Governor of Massachusetts. In 1903 and 1904 he was reëlected in spite of the fact that W. L. Douglas, the Democratic candidate, was chosen Governor. For three years (1906-09) he himself served as Governor, and at the National Republican Convention of 1908 he received 75 votes for Vice-President. In 1910 President Taft appointed him special ambassador to represent the United States at the celebration of the centenary of the Republic of Mexico. For two years (1911-13), also by appointment of President Taft, he held the post of American Ambassador to Russia. On coming home he resumed the direction of the *Commercial Bulletin*, but not to the exclusion of much quasi-public activity. He was the first president of the commission to suggest plans for commemorating in 1920 the three-hundredth anniversary of the landing of the Pilgrim Fathers. Having seen the American diplomatic service on the inside, he urged its reform. At different times he declined the offer of the first assistant postmaster-generalship and of the chairmanship of the national Civil Service Commission; he was "mentioned" more than once for a cabinet position and for nomination as United States Senator for Massachusetts. He remained through life a consistent Republican, but broke away earlier than most of the Republican politicians around him from "Stand-pattism" — an indication of independence

which the public commended, but which probably barred him from the senatorship.

From his youth up Guild took a keen interest in military concerns. In 1890 he joined Troop A, Mass. Volunteer Militia, popularly known as the Lancers. Governor Roger Wolcott appointed him to his staff as Inspector-General of Rifle Practice with the commission of Brigadier-General (1896). When the news came of the sinking of the *Maine* (February 15, 1898) Guild believed that war with Spain was inevitable. He resigned from the militia and was commissioned first lieutenant and adjutant-general of 6th Massachusetts Infantry, U. S. V. On the outbreak of the war, having been promoted to Lieutenant-Colonel and Inspector-General, he served in Cuba under General Fitzhugh Lee throughout the summer and autumn. He became Inspector-General of the Province of Havana, and in January, 1899, he declined a commission in the regular army and an appointment to the Insular Commission. In 1901 he also declined the election to command the Second Brigade, M. V. M.

A facile, and often forcible, writer Guild found time, outside of his regular editorial work and his many duties, to contribute frequently to the magazines and weeklies. He wrote a lively account of "Roosevelt at Harvard," which was printed in the *Harvard Graduates' Magazine* (December, 1901).

During Mr. Guild's three years' service as Governor much legislation was passed which was either suggested by him or carried through by his support. He was solicitous to curtail existing monopolies and to prevent the formation of new ones. He favored laws to put an end to gambling, prize fighting, bucket shops and loan sharks, and was especially interested in the protection of Italian immigrants from the sharpers of various kinds who preyed upon them. He favored legislation in behalf of women and children workers, and of the better sanitation and ventilation of factories and workshops. With his help many new institutions were organized, such as an excise board, a juvenile court and a police system for Boston; a board to control savings bank insurance; a hospital for feeble-minded; commissions on insurance laws, on old-age pensions, on commerce and industry, on metropolitan development and on laws relating to the insane. He threw his influence to secure cheaper

gas, cheaper electricity and cheaper telephone service. He made appointments without regard to creed or race. In general, it may be said that coming at a time when new issues in industries, in labor, and in physical and moral hygiene were pressing forward he gave to each attentive consideration.

A single instance illustrates Guild's lively sense of responsibility when he was Governor. In order to see how long it would take to walk from Riverside to the house in Weston where a degenerate named Tucker committed a shocking murder, Guild himself, unknown to the reporters, walked over the path Tucker had taken, and timed himself. Urged by a similar sense of duty, less than a month before his death he got up from a sick bed in order to speak in Faneuil Hall to protest against the passage of the Shipping Bill — and he never spoke more impressively. As a public speaker he was best when least oratorical, but he always succeeded in carrying his audiences; and on non-political subjects he spoke or lectured with ease. He had the indefinable quality which made him personally popular with large numbers of men and women, so that his death called forth such a demonstration of admiration and affectionate respect as had not been equalled in Boston since Governor W. E. Russell died in 1896.

Governor Guild's real service as Ambassador to Russia consisted in his successful propitiation of the dominant persons in court and official circles. He was popular among all classes, who were attracted by his frankness and bonhomie. During his term of service at Petrograd the treaty between the United States and Russia was denounced, and there can be little question but that the rupture would have resulted in more irritation had it not been for the personal esteem in which our Ambassador was held there. He had so impressed the Russians with the genuineness of American good-will that this impression survived even the breaking of the treaty.

In religion Guild was a Unitarian, a member of the Arlington Street Church, Boston (where his funeral was held), and a former President of the Unitarian Association. Italy conferred on him the decoration of Grand Officer of the Order of the Crown of Italy, and Russia the Grand Cordon of the Order of St. Alexander Nevski. He was a Free Mason and first commander of the Naval and Military Order of the Spanish-Ameri-

can War, a member of the Massachusetts Historical Society, of the Civil Service Reform Association, and President of the American Forestry Association. Among his social attachments were the Tavern, Puritan (of which he was President), Algonquin, Exchange, University, Harvard and Union clubs of Boston; the Brookline Country Club; the Middlesex and other political clubs; the Press Club and the Boston Chamber of Commerce. On June 1, 1892, he married in Boston, Charlotte Howe, daughter of Edward Crosby and Alice (Robbins) Johnson. Mrs. Guild survives him; they had no children.